arXiv:0903.3460v2 [math.CV] 24 Mar 2009

THE BEST BOUND OF THE AREA–LENGTH RATIO IN AHLFORS COVERING SURFACE THEORY (I)

GUANG YUAN ZHANG

Abstract. In Ahlfors' covering surface theory, it is well known that there exists a positive constant h such that for any nonconstant holomorphic mapping $f:\overline{\Delta}\to S$, if $f(\Delta)\cap\{0,1,\infty\}=\emptyset$, then

$$A(f,\Delta)\leq hL(f,\partial\Delta),$$

where Δ is the disk $|z|<1$ in $\mathbb{C}$, S is the unit Riemann sphere, $A(f,\Delta)$ is the area of the image of Δ and $L(f,\partial\Delta)$ is the length of the image of $\partial\Delta$, both counting multiplicities.

In this paper, we will show that the best lower bound for h is the number

$$h_0=\max_{\tau\in[0,1]}\left[\frac{\sqrt{1+\tau^2}\,(\pi+\arcsin\tau)}{\operatorname{arccot}\frac{\sqrt{1-\tau^2}}{\sqrt{1+\tau^2}}}-\tau\right]=4.034\,159\,790\,51\ldots,$$

and this is the exact estimation, i.e. there exists a sequence of holomorphic mappings $f_n:\overline{\Delta}\to S$ such that $f_n(\Delta)\cap\{0,1,\infty\}=\emptyset$ and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}A(f_n,\Delta)/L(f_n,\partial\Delta)=h_0.$$

1. Introduction

In this paper, the Riemann sphere S is the unit sphere

$$S=\{(x_1,x_2,x_3)\in\mathbb{R}^3;\ x_1^2+x_2^2+x_3^2=1\}$$

endowed with the stereographic projection

$$P:\overline{\mathbb{C}}=\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}\to S$$

with $P(0)=(0,0,-1)$, $P(\infty)=(0,0,1)$. The lengths of curves and the areas of domains in S are defined in the usual way. Thus, P induces the spherical metric $ds=\rho(z)|dz|=\frac{2}{1+|z|^2}|dz|, z\in\mathbb{C}$. For a set V in $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$, we denote by ∂V its boundary and $\overline{V}$ its closure.

We will identify the extended plane $\overline{\mathbb{C}}=\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}$ with S, via the stereographic projection P. So for any set $D\subset\mathbb{C}$, we will also write $D\subset S$, but in the later relation, D in fact means the set $P(D)$. When we write $0\in S$, for example, 0 indicates the point $P(0)=(0,0,-1)$ in S. In this way, some notations in $\mathbb{C}$ will be used in S: we use the interval notation $[-1,1],[0,+\infty]$ to denote the line segment $P([-1,1]),P([0,+\infty])$ in S, etc.

For a Jordan domain U in $\mathbb{C}$ and a holomorphic mapping $g:\overline{U}\to S$, we denote by $A(g,U)$ the spherical area of the image of U, counted with multiplicities, and denote by $L(g,\partial U)$ the spherical length of the image of ∂U, counted with multiplicities. If

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 30D35, 30D45, 52B60.

Project 10271063 and 10571009 supported by NSFC.

we regard g as a mapping from from $\overline{U}$ into $\overline{\mathbb{C}} = \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$, via the stereographic projection P, we have

$$A(g,U) = \iint_U (\rho(g(z))|g(z)|)^2 dxdy,\ z = x + iy;$$

$$L(g,\partial U) = \int_{\partial U} \rho(g(z))\,|g(z)|\,|dz|.$$

In Ahlfors' covering surface theory ([1], [4]), it is well known that there exists a positive constant h such that for any holomorphic mapping $f : \overline{\Delta} \to S$, if $f(z) \neq 0, 1, \infty$ for any $z \in \Delta$, then

$$A(f,\Delta) \leq hL(f,\partial\Delta). \tag{1.1}$$

The goal of this paper is to give the best lower bound for h, and our main result is the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $f : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ be a nonconstant holomorphic mapping such that $f(z) \neq 0, 1, \infty$ for any $z \in \Delta$. Then*

$$A(f,\Delta) < h_0 L(f,\partial\Delta), \tag{1.2}$$

where

$$h_0 = \max_{\tau\in[0,1]} \left[\frac{\sqrt{1+\tau^2}\,(\pi + \arcsin\tau)}{\operatorname{arccot}\frac{\sqrt{1-\tau^2}}{\sqrt{1+\tau^2}}} - \tau \right] = 4.03415979051\ldots, \tag{1.3}$$

and h_0 is the best lower bound in the sense that there exists a sequences of holomorphic mappings $f_n : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ such that $f_n(\Delta) \cap \{0, 1, \infty\} = \emptyset$ and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{A(f_n,\Delta)}{L(f_n,\partial\Delta)} = h_0.$$

Consider the function

$$h(\tau) = \frac{\sqrt{1+\tau^2}\,(\pi + \arcsin\tau)}{\operatorname{arccot}\frac{\sqrt{1-\tau^2}}{\sqrt{1+\tau^2}}} - \tau, \tau \in [0,1]. \tag{1.4}$$

It is clear that

$$h(0) = 4, h(1) = 3\sqrt{2} - 1 < 4,$$

and

$$h'(0) = \frac{4}{\pi} - 1 > 0.$$

Thus, h takes its maximum h_0 at some point $\tau_0 \in (0,1)$ and $h_0 > 4$.

For a domain U in S, we denote by $A(U)$ the area of U. If $U \subset \mathbb{C}$, we still use the notation $A(U)$ to denote the spherical area of U, which is the area of $P(U)$ given by

$$A(U) = \iint_U (\rho(x + iy))^2 dxdy.$$

For a curve $\Gamma = \Gamma(t), t \in [0,1]$, in S, we denote by $L(\Gamma)$ the length of the set $\Gamma = \{\Gamma(t); t \in [0,1]\}$. If $\Gamma = \Gamma(t), t \in [0,1]$, is a curve in $\mathbb{C}$, we still denote by $L(\Gamma)$ the spherical length of Γ, which is the length of the set $P(\Gamma)$, and in the case that Γ is simple we have

$$L(\Gamma) = \int_\Gamma \rho(z)|dz|.$$

Now we explain the geometric meaning of the function $h(\tau)$ given by (1.4). Let D be the disk in S with diameter $\overline{1,\infty}$, the shortest path from 1 to ∞ in S. Let $l \in [\pi, \sqrt{2}\pi]$ and let D_l be a domain inside D whose boundary is composed of the two congruent circular arcs, each of which has endpoints $\{1,\infty\}$ and spherical length $\frac{l}{2}$. Then we have $L(\partial D_l) = l$. It is clear that D_l, regarded as a domain in $\mathbb{C}$, is an angular domain whose vertex is 1 and bisector is the ray $[1, +\infty)$ in $\mathbb{C}$. We denote by $2\theta_l$ the value of the angle of this angular domain. Then it is clear that $\theta_l < \frac{\pi}{2}$.

It is proved in Section 4 that the area $A(D_l)$ and the length $L(\partial D_l) = l$ are real analytic functions of $\tau = \sin\theta_l, \theta_l \in [0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$, and when we understand $A(D_l)$ and l, in the ratio $\frac{4\pi + A(D_l)}{l}$, as functions of $\tau = \sin\theta_l$, we obtain the function $h(\tau)$ given by (1.4):

$$h(\tau) = \frac{A(S) + A(D_l)}{l} = \frac{4\pi + A(D_l)}{l}, \tau \in [0, 1]. \tag{1.5}$$

This is the geometrical meaning of the function $h(\tau)$.

Considering that $l \geq \pi$ and $A(D_l) \leq A(D) = 2\pi(1 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2})$, we have

$$h(\tau) \leq \frac{4\pi + 2\pi(1 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2})}{\pi} < 4.6,$$

and then

$$4 < h_0 < 4.6.$$

A numerical computation shows that

$$h_0 = 4.034\,159\,790\,51\ldots$$

The inequality (1.1) directly follows from the fundamental theorem of L. Ahlfors' covering surface theory ([1], [4]) for a finite number of points $a_1, \ldots, a_q$:

Theorem 1.2 (Ahlfors)**.** *Let $a_1, \ldots, a_q$ be distinct q points in S. Then there exists a positive constant $h = h(a_1, \ldots, a_q)$ such that for any meromorphic function defined on $\overline{\Delta}$*

$$(q-2)A(f, \Delta)/4\pi \leq \sum_{m=1}^{q} n(f, a_m) + hL(f, \partial\Delta), \tag{1.6}$$

where $n(f, a_m)$ is the number of solutions of the equation $f(z) = a_m, z \in \Delta$, ignoring multiplicities.

Remark 1.1. *J. Dufresnoy's work* [3] *may be the first literature estimating the number h in (1.6) explicitly, in which it is shown that the number h in (1.6) can be taken to be $h = h_1 = \frac{3}{2\delta_0}$, where δ_0 is the smallest spherical distance between the points $a_m, m = 1, \ldots, q$. When $f(z) \neq 0, 1, \infty, z \in \Delta$, Dufresnoy's result is that*

$$A(f, \Delta) \leq 12L(f, \partial\Delta).$$

Remark 1.2. *J. Dufresnoy's work* [3] *also studied the relationship between the constant in (1.1) and some other classical constants, such as Landau's, Bloch's and Schotkii's constants. This is also introduced in the book* [4] *by Haymann.*

To prove the main theorem, the difficulty lies in the inequality (1.2). It seems hard to estimate the best lower bound for the constant h by following Ahlfors' method in his covering surface theory. Fortunately, we managed to re-understand Ahlfors's theory via the classical isoperimetric inequality of the unit hemisphere which is obtained by F. Bernstein [2] in 1905 (see Section 4). The following is the outline of the proof of the main theorem.

(A). Observation for certain class of open mappings. We have been able to find that the area-length ratio is relative easy to figure out for a special family F of mappings from $\overline{\Delta}$ into S such that for each $f \in F$, f satisfies the following conditions (a)–(e):

(a) f is open, discrete[1] and continuous, the boundary curve $\Gamma_f = f(z), z \in \partial\Delta$, is a polygonal curve in S and $f(\Delta) \cap \{0, 1, \infty\} = \emptyset$.

(b) Each natural edge[2] of Γ has spherical length strictly less than π.

(c) Γ_f is locally convex everywhere except at $0, 1, \infty$.

(d) All branched points of f are located in $\{0, 1, \infty\}$.

(e) $\Gamma_f \cap [0, +\infty]$ contains at most finitely many points. Here $[0, +\infty]$ denotes the line segment in S from 0 to ∞ passing through 1.

It is clear that normal mappings defined in Section 3 satisfy condition (a). Conversely, any mapping satisfying (a) that is orientation preserved is a normal mapping[3]. It is relatively easy to estimate the area–length ratio for mappings in the family F : for each $f \in F$ one can obtain the following inequality by Lemmas 14.1 and 14.2,

$$A(f, \Delta) \leq h_0 L(g, \partial\Delta) - \min\{A(f, \Delta), 4\pi\},$$

where h_0 is given by (1.3).

On the other hand, it is fortunate that we are able to prove that, for any holomorphic mapping $f : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ with $f(\Delta) \cap \{0, 1, \infty\} = \emptyset$, and for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist a finite number of mappings $\{g_1, \dots, g_n\}$ in the family F, such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} A(g_j, \Delta) \geq A(f, \Delta) - \varepsilon, \text{ and } \sum_{j=1}^{n} L(g_j, \partial\Delta) \leq L(f, \partial\Delta) + \varepsilon. \tag{1.7}$$

Summarizing the above two aspects, we obtain (1.2).

The existence of the family $\{g_1, \dots, g_n\}$, which is given by Theorem 12.1, is the first key step to prove the main theorem. Sections 8–11 is prepared for proving Theorem 12.1: we first prove Theorems 10.1 and 11.1, and then we apply these two results to deduce Theorem 12.1 in Section 12. The ingredients of Sections 8 and 9 are Theorem 8.1, Lemma 9.2 and Lemma 9.3, which are just used to prove Theorem 10.1 and Theorem 11.1. We will give the outline for the proof of Theorem 12.1 in the following part (B).

The content of Sections 4–7 and 13 is for proving Lemmas 14.1 and 14.2, which, with the existence of the family $\{g_1, \dots, g_n\}$, deduce the main theorem in the last section, Section 14. In Section 4, we introduce two classical results, the Bernstein's isoperimetric inequality of the unit hemisphere and the Ladó's theorem, from which we prove Theorems 4.3 and 4.4 that is used in Section 14 for proving Lemmas 14.1 and 14.2. Sections 5 and 6 are prepared for Section 7, and the ingredient of Section 7 is Theorem 7.1, which is the second key step to prove the main theorem: with Theorems 4.3, 4.4 and 13.1, it deduces Lemmas 14.1 and 14.2. Theorem 13.1, which is proved just based on Lemma 6.3 and Corollary 7.1, is the third key step to prove the main theorem.

---

[1] The term *discrete* means that for each $q \in f(\overline{\Delta})$, $f^{-1}(q)$ is a finite set.

[2] See Definition 2.2 (2) and (3).

[3] We will not introduce the proof for this conclusion, since it is not used in this paper.

(B). The existence of $\{g_1,\dots,g_n\}$ in (A). Now, we introduce the outline to prove the existence of $\{g_1,\dots,g_n\}$. Let $f:\overline{\Delta}\to S$ be a holomorphic mapping with $f(\Delta)\cap\{0,1,\infty\}=\emptyset$. To show the existence of the family $\{g_1,\dots,g_n\}$, for any $\varepsilon>0$, we first approximate f by an open mapping f_1 such that f_1 satisfies (a) and (b) in (A) and

$$A(f_1,\Delta)>A(f,\Delta)-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\text{ and }L(f_1,\partial\Delta)<L(f,\partial\Delta)-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Then we are able to first show that there exist a finite number of mappings $\{G_1,\dots,G_n\}$ that satisfy (1.7) and (a)–(d) as follows.

Operation 1: (a)(b)→(a)(b)(c). We can apply Theorem 11.1 several times to obtain a mapping f_2 such that f_2 satisfies (a)–(c) and

$$A(f_2,\Delta)\geq A(f_1,\Delta)\text{ and }L(f_2,\partial\Delta)\leq L(f_1,\partial\Delta).$$

If f_2 satisfies (d), then $\{G_1\}=\{f_2\}$ is the desired family. Otherwise we turn to next operation.

Operation 2: (a)(b)(c)→(a)(b)(d). If f_2 does not satisfies (d), then we can apply Theorem 10.1 a finite number of times to decompose f_2 into a finite[4] number of mappings $f_{2j}, j=1,\dots,m$, that satisfy (a), (b), (d) and

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m}A(f_{2j},\Delta)\geq A(f_2,\Delta)\text{ and }\sum_{j=1}^{m}L(f_{2j},\partial\Delta)\leq L(f_2,\partial\Delta).$$

Operation 2 may destroy condition (c)! We try to repair this by applying Operation 1 to all the mappings f_{2j} and obtain mappings $f_{12j}, j=1,\dots,m$, that satisfy (a)–(c) and

$$A(f_{12j},\Delta)\geq A(f_{2j},\Delta)\text{ and }L(f_{12j},\partial\Delta)\leq L(f_{2j},\partial\Delta), j=1,\dots,m.$$

But Operation 1 may destroy condition (d)! We try to repair this by applying Operation 2 to each f_{12j} that has ramification points in Δ and obtain more mappings. But then condition (c) may again be destroyed for the mappings obtained from Operation 2.

It seems we are arguing in a circle! Luckily, we are able to prove that Operations 1 and 2 can not be applied infinitely many times! This is the ingredient of Theorem 12.1. Thus, we can execute Operations 1 and 2 alternatively with in a finite number of steps to obtain the desired mappings $G_j, j=1,\dots,n$.

From the mappings G_j we can easily obtain the mappings $g_j, j=1,2,\dots,n$, by slightly perturb each G_j.

Remark 1.3. *The method in this paper can also be used to estimate the best bound of the constant h in Ahlfors's fundamental theorem for any number (≥ 3) of points. We will discuss this in another paper.*

---

[4] By Theorem 10.1 (iv) we may assume $\sum_{j=1}^{m}V(f_{2j})\leq V(f_2)+2(m-1)$, where $V(f_2)$ is the number of natural vertices (see Definition 2.2) of the polygonal curve $\Gamma_{f_2}=f_2(z), z\in\partial\Delta$. Then by Lemma 12.1 we have $3m\leq V(f_2)+2(m-1)$, which implies $m\leq V(f_2)-2$, and then the finiteness follows.

2. SOME NOTATIONS AND DEFINITIONS RELATED TO CURVES IN S

In this section we introduce some notations, definitions and make some conventions. *Locally convex polygonal paths* and *locally convex polygonal curves* in the Riemann sphere S defined in this section play a central role in this paper.

Let $\Gamma = \Gamma(t), t \in [\alpha, \beta]$, be a curve in $\mathbb{C}$ or S. Then the orientation of the curve Γ will be regarded as the orientation as t increases. Therefore, if Γ is not closed, the orientation of Γ is from $\Gamma(\alpha)$ to $\Gamma(\beta)$, and we will denote by

$$-\Gamma = \Gamma(t_2 + t_1 - t), t \in [t_1, t_2],$$

the same curve with opposite orientation.

If $\Gamma_j = \Gamma_j(t), t \in [t_{j1}, t_{j2}]$, are two curves in $\mathbb{C}$ (or S) and $\Gamma_1(t_{12}) = \Gamma_2(t_{21})$, we will denote by $\Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2$ the curve

$$\Gamma(t) = \begin{cases} \Gamma_1(t), & t \in [t_{11}, t_{12}], \\ \Gamma_2(t + t_{21} - t_{12}), & t \in (t_{12}, t_{12} + t_{22} - t_{21}]. \end{cases}$$

When $\Gamma_1 + (-\Gamma_2)$ makes sense, we will write it by $\Gamma_1 - \Gamma_2$.

Curves in this paper are always oriented and continuous curves. Some times a curve Γ will be regard as a set in S. But this is only in the case that the curve is involved in some set operations.

For a Jordan domain D in $\mathbb{C}$, the boundary ∂D of D is always regarded as an oriented curve with the anticlockwise orientation. If D is a Jordan domain in $\mathbb{C}$ and $f : \overline{D} \to S$ is a continuous mapping, then the the boundary curve

$$\Gamma_f = \Gamma_f(z), z \in \partial D, \tag{2.1}$$

of f is always regarded as an oriented curve with the oreintation induced by ∂D.

The notation Γ_f will be used through out this paper, which alway denotes the curve given by (2.1) for any given Jordan domain D of $\mathbb{C}$ and any mapping $f : \overline{D} \to S$.

An oriented great circle C in S divides the sphere into two hemispheres. We will call the hemisphere that is on the left hand side of C *inside, or enclosed by,* C, in the sense that we are standing on the sphere with our heads pointing to the center of S, and going along C in the orientation of C. For example, when Δ is regarded as a disk in S, Δ is the lower hemisphere of S and Δ is inside the oriented circle $\partial\Delta$, i.e. $P(\Delta)$ is inside the great circle $P(\partial\Delta)$; and the upper hemisphere $\overline{\mathbb{C}} \backslash \overline{\Delta}$ in S is inside the oriented circle $-\partial\Delta$.

If Γ is a Jordan curve in S, then the domain in S that is bounded by Γ and is inside Γ is also called the domain inside, or enclosed by, Γ. Of course, here "inside" means "on the left hand side of".

A section of a great circle in S is called a *line segment.* To emphasize this, we also call it *straight line segment* or *geodesic line segment.*

The spherical distance of two points p and q in S will be denoted by $d(p, q)$. In the case that p and q are not antipodal, we denote by $\overline{pq}$ the shortest (simple) path in S from p to q, which is unique and is in fact the shorter of the two arcs with end points p and q of the great circle of S passing through p and q. We will write

$$\overline{q_1 q_2 \cdots q_n} = \overline{q_1 q_2} + \overline{q_2 q_3} + \cdots + \overline{q_{n-1} q_n},$$

if each term of the right hand side makes sense, where $q_1, \ldots, q_n$ are points in S.

We write $\overline{pq}$ by $\overline{p,q}$, if p, or q, or both, is replaced by explicit complex numbers. For example, we denote by the shortest path from $p=1$ to $q=2$ by $\overline{pq}=\overline{1,2}$. Note that we identify $\overline{\mathbb{C}}=\mathbb{C}\cup\{\infty\}$ with S, via the stereographic projection P.

When $\overline{pq}$ makes sense, we will denote by $\overline{pq}^{\circ}$ the interior of the path.

Definition 2.1. *A closed curve*

$$\Gamma=f(z),z\in\partial\Delta,$$

in S is called a polygonal closed curve *if and only if there exist a finite number of points $p_j\in\partial\Delta,j=1,\dots,n,$ with*

$$\arg p_1<\arg p_2<\cdots<\arg p_n<\arg p_1+2\pi \tag{2.2}$$

such that for each section[5] *α_j of $\partial\Delta$ from p_j to p_{j+1} $(p_{n+1}=p_1)$, the section Γ_j of Γ restricted to α_j is a locally simple and locally straight path, and in this case*

$$\Gamma=\Gamma_1+\cdots+\Gamma_n$$

is called a partition *of* Γ.

Note that the term *partition* emphasizes that each term Γ_j is locally simple and locally straight. A locally simple and locally straight curve in S must be contained in some great circle of S. So, for each α_j in the above definition, each $p_0\in\alpha_j$ has a neighborhood L_{p_0} in α_j such that Γ restricted to L_{p_0} is a homeomorphism onto a line segment in S.

Through out this paper, we denote by E the set $\{0,1,\infty\}$ in S.

Definition 2.2. *Let $\Gamma=f(z),z\in\partial\Delta$, be a polygonal closed curve in S.*

(1) A point $p_0\in\partial D$ is called a natural vertex *of Γ if and only if one of the following conditions holds:*

(a) $f(p_0)\in E=\{0,1,\infty\}$.

(b) $f(p_0)\notin E$ and for any neighborhood I_{p_0} of p_0 in $\partial\Delta$, the restriction $\Gamma|_{I_{p_0}}=f(z),z\in I_{p_0}$, can not be a straight and simple path.

(2) In the case that Γ has at least two natural vertices, a closed interval I in $\partial\Delta$ is called a natural edge *of Γ if and only if the endpoints of I are both natural vertices of Γ but the interior of I does not contain any natural vertex of Γ.*

(3) If I is a natural edge of Γ, then the restriction $\Gamma|_I=f(z),z\in I$, is also called a natural edge *of* Γ.

For the above definition (2), the reader should be aware that a natural edge can not contain any point of $f^{-1}(E)=f^{-1}(\{0,1,\infty\})$ in its interior (in $\partial\Delta$), because by definition each point in $f^{-1}(E)$ is a natural vertex. Thus, one can not understand any natural edge to be a maximal interval on which Γ is locally simple and locally straight. If we regard the great circle C determined[6] by $\overline{0,1}$ as a simple closed curve, it has three natural edges $\overline{0,1},\overline{1,\infty}$ and $\overline{\infty,-1,1}=\overline{\infty,-1}+\overline{-1,1}$, but the whole curve C is simple and straight.

If Γ has no any natural vertex, Γ must be a closed curve contained in some great circle C_1 of S with $C_1\cap\{0,1,\infty\}=\emptyset$ and Γ is locally simple, and in this case, $\partial\Delta$ is regard as a natural edge without endpoints.

If Γ has only one natural vertex $p_0\in\partial\Delta$, then, by the definition, $q_0=f(p_0)=0,1$ or ∞, and Γ must be also contained in some great circle C_2 of S so that

---

[5] A section of a curve always inherits the orientation of the curve.

[6] This is in the sense that C contains $\overline{0,1}$ and is oriented by $\overline{0,1}$.

$C_2 \cap \{0, 1, \infty\} = \{q_0\}$ and Γ must be a simple path from q_0 to q_0. In this case $\partial\Delta$ will be regarded as a natural edge with endpoints coinciding at the unique natural vertex q_0.

Definition 2.3. *Let* $\Gamma = f(z), z \in \partial\Delta$, *be a* polygonal closed curve *and assume that* $p_1 \in \partial\Delta$ *is a natural vertex of* Γ. *Then there uniquely exist a finite number of points* $p_j \in \partial\Delta, j = 1, \ldots, n$, *with (2.2) such that* $p_1, \ldots, p_n$ *is an enumeration of all natural vertices of* Γ. *In this case,*

$$\Gamma = \Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2 + \cdots + \Gamma_n \tag{2.3}$$

is called a natural partition *of* Γ, *where each* Γ_j *is the restriction of* Γ *to the section* α_j *of* $\partial\Delta$ *from* p_j *to* p_{j+1} $(p_{n+1} = p_n)$, *and*

$$\partial\Delta = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \cdots + \alpha_n \tag{2.4}$$

is also called a natural partition *of* $\partial\Delta$ *corresponding to (2.3).*

Remark 2.1. *For the sake of simplicity and avoiding confusions, we make the following conventions.*

(1) When we say that Γ' *is a natural edge of a polygonal closed curve* $\Gamma = f(z), z \in \partial\Delta$, *we always mean that* Γ *and* $\partial\Delta$ *have natural partitions (2.3) and (2.4), respectively, such that* Γ' *is the restriction* $\Gamma_j = f(z), z \in \alpha_j$, *for some* j.

(2) When we use (2.3) to denote a natural partition of Γ, *we always mean that there is a natural partition (2.4) corresponding to (2.3). Then, in the above definition we also call* $q_j = f(p_j)$, *which should be understood to be the pair* (p_j, q_j), *a* natural vertex *of* Γ *for* $j = 1, \ldots, n$.

Definition 2.4. *A partition*

$$\Gamma = \Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2 + \cdots + \Gamma_n$$

of a closed polygonal curve in S *is called a* permitted partition *if each* Γ_j *is contained in some natural edge of* Γ.

A polygonal Jordan curve in S that is composed of exactly three line segments is called a *triangle*. Note that a vertex of a triangle may not be a natural vertex. Any great circle may be regarded as a triangle, while it has no any natural vertex.

Definition 2.5. *Let* $\Gamma = \Gamma(z), z \in \partial\Delta$, *be a closed polygonal curve in* S.

(1) For a point $p_0 \in \partial\Delta$, Γ *is called* convex *at* p_0, *if* p_0 *has a neighborhood* I *in* $\partial\Delta$ *such that the following two conditions (a) and (b) hold.*

(a) The restriction $\Gamma|_I$ *of* Γ *to* I *is a simple path.*

(b) Either $\Gamma|_I$ *is straight or* $\Gamma' = \Gamma|_I + \overline{p''p'}$, *in which* p' *and* p'' *are the initial and terminal point of* $\Gamma|_I$, *respectively, is a triangle which encloses*[7] *a convex triangle domain in* S.

(2) Γ *is called* strictly convex *at* $p_0 \in \partial\Delta$ *if* Γ *is convex at* p_0 *and for any neighborhood* I *of* p_0 *in* $\partial\Delta$, $\Gamma|_I$ *is not straight.*

(3). For a point $q_0 \in S$, Γ *is called* convex *at* $q_0 \in S$ *if and only if for each* $p \in \partial\Delta$ *with* $\Gamma(p) = q_0$, Γ *is convex at* p.

(4). For a set $T \subset S$, *the closed curve* Γ *is called* locally convex in T *if and only if* Γ *is convex at each point* $q_0 \in T$.

---

[7] By definition, "encloses" means the triangle domain is "on the left hand side of" of the triangle Γ'.

It is clear that if Γ is convex at $q_0 \in S$, then for some neighborhood T of q_0 in S, Γ is locally convex in T.

Definition 2.6. *A path*

$$\Gamma = \Gamma(t), t \in [0,1],$$

in S, *is called a* polygonal path *if and only if* $[0,1]$ *has a partition*

$$0 = t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_n = 1, \tag{2.5}$$

such that the section $\Gamma_j = \Gamma(t), t \in [t_{j-1}, t_j]$, *is a locally simple and locally straight path,* $j = 1, \ldots, n$, *and in this case*

$$\Gamma = \Gamma_1 + \cdots + \Gamma_n$$

is called a partition *of* Γ.

Natural vertices, natural edges, natural partition, permitted partitions and convex vertices of a polygonal path $\Gamma = \Gamma(t), t \in [0,1]$, in S, can be defined as that for polygonal closed curves. But convex vertices are only defined in the open interval $(0,1)$ of $[0,1]$ and we don't call the endpoints 0 and 1 natural vertices. To avoid confusions we write these definitions completely.

Definition 2.7. *Let* $\Gamma = f(t), t \in [0,1]$, *be a polygonal path in* S.

(1) A point $p_0 \in (0,1)$ *is called a* natural vertex *of* Γ *if and only if one of the following conditions holds:*

(a) $f(p_0) \in E = \{0, 1, \infty\}$.

(b) $f(p_0) \notin E$ *and for any neighborhood* I_{p_0} *of* p_0 *in* $(0,1)$, *the restriction* $\Gamma|_{I_{p_0}} = f(t), t \in I_{p_0}$, *can not be a straight and simple path.*

(2) A closed interval I *in* $[0,1]$ *is called a* natural edge *of* Γ *if and only if each endpoint of* I *is either* 0, *or* 1, *or a natural vertex of* Γ, *and the interior of* I *does not contain any natural vertex of* Γ.

(3) If I *is a natural edge of* Γ, *the restriction* $\Gamma|_I = f(t), t \in I$, *is also called a* natural edge *of* Γ.

Definition 2.8. *For a polygonal path* $\Gamma = f(t), t \in [0,1]$, *a partition*

$$\Gamma = \Gamma_1 + \cdots + \Gamma_n \tag{2.6}$$

is called a natural partition *of* Γ, *if and only if* $[0,1]$ *has a partition*

$$0 = t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_n = 1, \tag{2.7}$$

such that each $[t_{j-1}, t_j]$ *is a natural edge of* Γ, *and* Γ_j *is the restriction of* Γ *to* $[t_{j-1}, t_j], j = 1, \ldots, n$, *in this case (2.7) is also called a* natural partition *of* $[0,1]$ *corresponding to (2.6).*

Remark 2.2. *We make similar conventions as in Remark 2.1 for polygonal paths.*

(1) When we say that Γ' *is a natural edge of a polygonal path* $\Gamma = f(t), t \in [0,1]$, *we always mean that* Γ *and* $[0,1]$ *have natural partitions (2.6) and (2.7), respectively, such that* Γ' *is the restriction* $\Gamma_j = f(t), t \in [t_{j-1}, t_j]$, *for some* j.

(2) When we use (2.6) to denote a natural partition of Γ, *we always mean that there is a natural partition (2.7) corresponding to (2.6). Then, in the above definition we also call* $q_j = f(t_j)$, *which should be understood to be the pair* (t_j, q_j), *a natural vertex of* Γ *for* $j = 1, \ldots, n-1$.

Definition 2.9. *Let* $\Gamma = \Gamma(t), t \in [0,1]$, *be a polygonal path in* S.

(1) For a point $p_0 \in (0,1)$, Γ *is called* convex *at* p_0, *if there is a closed interval* $I \subset (0,1)$ *such that (a) and (b) in Definition 2.5 (1) hold.*

(2) Γ *is called* strictly convex *at* $p_0 \in \partial\Delta$ *if* Γ *is convex at* p_0 *and for any neighborhood* I *of* p_0 *in* $(0,1)$, $\Gamma|_I$ *is not straight.*

(3). For a point $q_0 \in S$, Γ *is called* convex *at* $q_0 \in S$ *if and only if for each* $p \in (0,1)$ *with* $\Gamma(p) = q_0$, Γ *is convex at* p.

(4). For a set $T \subset S$, *the closed curve* Γ *is called* locally convex in T *if and only if* Γ *is convex at each point* $q_0 \in T$.

Geometrically, a locally convex path (or curve) has the property that when we go ahead along the path (or curve) with our heads pointing to the center of the sphere S, we always go straight or turn left.

Remark 2.3. *The term "closed polygonal path" and "closed polygonal curve" have distinct meaning in some sense. If a polygonal path* Γ *given by its natural partition (2.6), the natural vertices mean* $t_1, \ldots, t_{n-1}$. *But when* $f(0) = f(1)$ *and* Γ *is regarded as a* closed curve, $t_1, \ldots, t_{n-1}$ *are still natural vertices of* Γ, $t_0 = 0$, *identified with* $t_n = 1$, *may or may not be a natural vertex of the* closed curve Γ. *Closed polygonal paths still emphasize the initial and terminal points, while for a closed polygonal curve, there is no initial and terminal points, all points on it have equality.*

Remark 2.4. *A* locally convex polygonal Jordan path *that is closed may not be a* locally convex polygonal Jordan curve, *by the definition.*

Definition 2.10. *A polygonal Jordan curve in* S *that is either a great circle, or is composed of exactly two straight edges is called a biangle. A biangle divides the sphere* S *into two biangle domains.*

Note that a biangle may contains more than two natural edges, in the case that it contains 0, 1 or ∞ in its straight edges.

Definition 2.11. *A triangle in* S *is called a* generic *triangle if it encloses a triangle domain whose three angles are all strictly less than* π.

Definition 2.12. *A Jordan curve* Γ *in* S *is called convex if the domain* $D_\Gamma \subset S$ *inside* Γ *is a convex domain in the sense that for any two points* q_1 *and* q_2 *in* D_Γ, *there is a line segment* $L \subset S$ *with endpoints* q_1 *and* q_2 *such that* $L \subset D_\Gamma$.

Remark 2.5. *By the definition, each locally convex polygonal Jordan curve is a convex curve and is contained in some closed hemisphere, while any locally convex curve that is not simple may not be contained in any closed hemisphere.*

Remark 2.6. *Any triangle* Γ *in* S *all of whose edges have length* $\leq \pi$ *has a orientation so that* Γ *is a convex polygonal Jordan curve. But when a triangle* Γ *in* S *has an edge with length* $> \pi$, Γ, *with either orientation, may not be a locally convex triangle.*

Remark 2.7. *For any convex triangle* Γ *in* S, *the triangle domain enclosed*[8] *by* Γ *is contained in some hemisphere of* S. *Conversely, any triangle domain whose closure is contained in some open hemisphere of* S *is enclosed by a generic convex triangle in the same open hemisphere.*

---

[8] By definition, "enclosed" means "on the left hand side of".

3. Definition and some properties of Normal mappings

The proof of the main theorem is based on the investigation of so called normal mappings defined in this section, which are the mappings satisfying condition (a) in Section 1. But we will use another definition.

Definition 3.1. *Let D be a Jordan domain in $\mathbb{C}$. A mapping $f:\overline{D}\to S$ is called a* normal mapping *if the following five conditions are satisfied:*

(a) The boundary curve $\Gamma_f=f(z),z\in\partial D$, is a polygonal closed curve.

(b) For each $p\in D$, there exist a neighborhood $U\subset D$ of p, a disk V in S centered at $q=f(p)$ and homeomorphisms $h_1:U\to\Delta$ and $h_2:V\to\Delta$, such that

$$h_2\circ f|_U\circ h_1^{-1}(\zeta)=\zeta^d,\zeta\in\Delta$$

for some positive integer d.

(c) For each $p\in\partial D$, there exists a neighborhood U of p in $\overline{D}$, a disk V in S centered at $q=f(p)$ and homeomorphisms $h_1:\overline{U}\to\overline{\Delta^+}$ and $h_2:\overline{V}\to\overline{\Delta}$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} h_1\left(\overline{U}\cap\partial D\right) &= [-1,1],\\ h_2\circ f|_{\overline{U}}\circ h_1^{-1}(\zeta) &= \zeta^d,\zeta\in\overline{\Delta^+}, \end{aligned}$$

for some positive integer d, where Δ^+ is the upper half disk $\{\zeta\in\Delta,\mathrm{Im}\zeta>0\}$.

(d) $f(D)\cap\{0,1,\infty\}=\emptyset$.

(e) f is orientation preserved in the sense that $P^{-1}\circ f$ is orientation preserved, where P is the stereographic projection.

The reader should be aware of that a normal mapping satisfies condition (a) in Section 1. Conversely, a mapping that is orientation preserved and satisfies (a) in Section 1 must be a normal mapping, but this is not important for us.

In the above definition if for some point $p\in D$, the corresponding $d\geq 2$, then p is called a *ramification point*, $f(q)$ is called a *branched point*, $v_f(p)=d$ is called the *multiplicity* of f at p, and $b_f(p)=d-1$ is called the *branched number* of f at p.

If for some $p\in\partial D$, the corresponding $d\geq 3$, then p is called a *ramification point*, $f(q)$ is called a *branched point*, $v_f(p)=\left[\frac{d}{2}\right]$ is called the multiplicity of f at p, and $b_f(p)=\left[\frac{d+1}{2}\right]-1$ is called the branched number of f at p.

In the definition, "orientation preserved" means that for any regular point $p\in\overline{\Delta}$ of f, there is a closed Jordan domain K_p in $\overline{\Delta}$ that is a neighborhood[9] of p in $\overline{\Delta}$ such that $\widetilde{f}=P^{-1}\circ f$ or $\frac{1}{\widetilde{f}}$ maps K_p homeomorphically onto a Jordan domain K' in $\mathbb{C}$ such that when z goes along ∂K_p anticlockwise, $\widetilde{f}(z)$ goes along $\partial K'$ anticlockwise.

For a normal mapping $f:\overline{D}\to S$, f has only finitely many ramification points. $p\in\overline{D}$ is called a regular point of f if $v_p(f)=1$.

The reader may be puzzled by the definition of $v_f(p)$ and $b_f(p)$ when $p\in\partial D$. As a matter of fact, the definition in this case follows from the fact that we can extend the mapping f to be a normal mapping so that p becomes an interior ramification point with multiplicity $\left[\frac{d+1}{2}\right]$.

For a Jordan domain D and a normal mapping $f:\overline{D}\to S$, the boundary curve $\Gamma_f=f(z),z\in\partial D$, is a polygonal closed curve. Then the term *natural vertex*,

---

[9] This means that if $p\in\Delta$, p is contained in the interior of K_p in $\mathbb{C}$, and if $p\in\partial\Delta$, p is contained in the interior of the arc $K_p\cap\partial\Delta$ in $\partial\Delta$.

natural edge, natural partition, permitted partition, etc. introduced in Section 2 are well defined for Γ_f.

Definition 3.2. *For a Jordan domain D and a normal mapping $f:\overline{D}\to S$. We define $V(f)$ to be the number of natural vertices of the boundary curve $\Gamma_f=f(z),z\in\partial D$; define $V_E(f)$ to be the number of natural vertices of Γ_f that is contained in E and define*

$$V_{NE}(f)=V(f)-V_E(f),$$

which is the number of natural vertices of Γ_f that is not contained in E.

Recall that E always denotes the set $\{0,1,\infty\}$ in S.

Let $f:\overline{D}\to S$ be a normal mapping. Then by the definition, $\overline{D}$ has a triangulation such that each ramification point of f is a vertex of the triangulation and f restricted to each triangle of the triangulation of $\overline{D}$ is a homeomorphism onto a real triangle on S, i.e., each edge of the triangle is straight. Then f and the triangulation of $\overline{D}$ induce a triangulation of the Riemann surface of f; which is consisted of real triangles in S. Therefore, the following two lemmas are obvious.

Lemma 3.1. *Let D be a Jordan domain in $\mathbb{C}$ and let $f:\overline{D}\to S$ be a normal mapping. Then for any Jordan domain D_1 contained in D, the restriction of f to $\overline{D_1}$ is a normal mapping, provided that the curve $f(z),z\in\partial D_1$, is a polygonal curve.*

Lemma 3.2. *Let D be a Jordan domain in $\mathbb{C}$, let α be a Jordan path in $\overline{D}$ such that the interior*[10] *of α is contained in D and α has two distinct endpoints lying on ∂D, let D_1 and D_2 be the two components of $D\backslash\alpha$, and let $f_j:\overline{D_j}\to S$ be two normal mappings, $j=1,2$. If $f_1(z)=f_2(z)$ for each $z\in\alpha$, then the mapping*

$$F=\begin{cases} f_1(z), z\in\overline{D_1},\\ f_2(z), z\in D\backslash\overline{D_1},\end{cases}$$

is a normal mapping defined on $\overline{D}$.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $f:\overline{\Delta}\to S$ be a normal mapping and let $q\in f(\overline{\Delta})$. Then, for sufficiently small disk $D(q)$ in S centered at q, $f^{-1}(\overline{D(q)})$ is a union of disjoint closed domains $\overline{U_j}$ in $\overline{\Delta},j=1,2,\ldots,n$, such that for each j, $\overline{U_j}$ is the closure of a (relatively) open subset U_j of $\overline{\Delta}$, $U_j\cap f^{-1}(q)$ contains exactly one point x_j and the followings holds:*

(i). If $x_j\in\Delta$, then f restricted to $\overline{U_j}$ is a branched covering mapping onto $\overline{D(q)}$ such that x_j is the unique possible ramification point.

(ii). If $x_j\in\partial\Delta$, then $f(\overline{U_j})=\overline{D(q)}$ or $f(\overline{U_j})$ is a closed sector of $\overline{D(q)}$, and there exist homeomorphisms ϕ_j from $\overline{U_j}$ onto the closed half disk $\overline{\Delta^+}$ and ψ_j from $D(q)$ onto $\overline{\Delta}$ such that

$$\phi_j(x_j)=0,\ \phi_j(\overline{U_j}\cap\partial\Delta)=[-1,1],$$

and

$$\psi_j\circ f\circ\phi_j^{-1}(\xi)=\xi^{d_j},\xi\in\overline{\Delta^+},$$

for some positive integer d_j.

Proof. The proof is quite simple and standard. Note that in (ii) $f(\overline{U_j}\cap\Delta)$ may be the disk $D(q)$ omitting a radius. □

---

[10] This means the curve α without endpoints.

Corollary 3.1. *Let* $f:\overline{\Delta}\to S$ *be a normal mapping that has a ramification point* $p_0\in\partial\Delta$. *Then* $\partial\Delta$ *has a section* α_1 *from* p_0 *to some point in* $\partial\Delta\backslash\{p_0\}$ *such that* $\beta=f(z),z\in\alpha_1$, *is a simple path in* S *starting from* $f(p_0)$ *and, lifted by* f, β *has* $b=b_f(p_0)$ *lifts* $\alpha_2,\dots,\alpha_{b+1}$ *that start from* p_0 *and satisfy*

$$\alpha_j\backslash\{p_0\}\subset\Delta, j=2,\dots,b+1.$$

Lemma 3.4. *Let* D *be a Jordan domain in* $\mathbb{C}$ *and let* $\alpha_j=\alpha_j(t),t\in[0,1]$, *be two paths contained in* ∂D *such that* $\alpha_1(0)=\alpha_2(0)$ *and* $\alpha_1\cap\alpha_2$ *contains at most two points. Let* $f:\overline{D}\to S$ *be a normal mapping such that*

$$f(\alpha_1(t))=f(\alpha_2(t)),t\in[0,1].$$

If $\alpha_1(1)\neq\alpha_2(1)$, *then* f *can be regarded as a normal mapping* $g:\overline{\Delta}\to S$ *such that*

$$A(g,\Delta)=A(f,D),L(g,\partial\Delta)=L(f,(\partial D)\setminus\{\alpha_1\cup\alpha_2\}),$$

and $\Gamma_g=g(z),z\in\partial\Delta$, *is the same as the closed curve*

$$\Gamma_f=f(z),z\in\{(\partial D)\setminus[\alpha_1\cup\alpha_2]\}\cup\{\alpha_1(1)\},$$

ignoring a parameter transformation.

If $\alpha_1(1)=\alpha_2(1)$, *then* f *can be regard as an open continuous mapping* g *from the sphere* S *onto itself. And so,* f *takes every value in* S.

Proof. The proof is the standard gluing argument that glue the domain D by identifying $\alpha_1(t)$ and $\alpha_2(t)$ for each $t\in[0,1]$. □

Lemma 3.5. *Let* $f:\overline{\Delta}\to S$ *be a normal mapping and let* $p_0\in\overline{\Delta}$ *be a ramification point of* f. *Assume that* $\beta=\beta(t),t\in[0,1]$, *is a polygonal Jordan path in* S *such that the followings hold.*

(a) $\beta(0)=f(p_0)$, β *has two distinct lifts* $\alpha_j=\alpha_j(t),t\in[0,1]$, *in* $\overline{\Delta}$ *by* f, *with* $\alpha_j(0)=p_0$ *and*

$$f(\alpha_1(t))=f(\alpha_2(t))=\beta(t),t\in[0,1],j=1,2. \tag{3.1}$$

(b) The interior $\alpha_j^\circ=\alpha_j(t),t\in(0,1)$, *of* α_j *is contained in* $\Delta,j=1,2$, *and*

$$\{\alpha_1(1),\alpha_2(1)\}\subset\partial\Delta.$$

(c) f *has no ramification point in the interior of* α_1 *and* α_2.

Then $\alpha_1(1)\neq\alpha_2(1)$.

Proof. Since there is no ramification point in the interiors of α_1 and α_2, we have

$$\alpha_1\cap\alpha_2\subset\{\alpha_1(0),\alpha_1(1)\}. \tag{3.2}$$

By (3.1) and (b),

$$\beta(t)\neq 0,1,\infty,t\in(0,1). \tag{3.3}$$

If $\alpha_1(1)=\alpha_2(1)$, then $\alpha_1-\alpha_2$, or $\alpha_2-\alpha_1$, encloses a Jordan domain D in $\overline{\Delta}$, and then by Lemma 3.4, $f(\overline{D})=S$. But f is a normal mapping, and then $f(D)\subset f(\Delta)\subset S\backslash\{0,1,\infty\}$, and then by (3.2) and (3.3) we have $f^{-1}(\{0,1,\infty\})\subset\{\alpha_1(0),\alpha_2(1)=\alpha_2(1)\}$. Therefore we have $f(\overline{D})\neq S$. This is a contradiction. □

4. A CLASSICAL ISOPERIMETRIC INEQUALITY OF THE UNIT HEMISPHERE

In this section we use Bernstein's isoperimetric inequality to prove theorems 4.3 and 4.4, which will be used in Section 14.

The following result is obtained by Bernstein in 1905.

Theorem 4.1 (Bernstein inequality [2])**.** *Let Γ be a simple curve in some hemisphere S^* of S. Then the length $L = L(\Gamma)$ and the area A of the domain in S^* enclosed by Γ satisfy*

$$L^2 \geq 4\pi A - A^2,$$

equality holds if and only if Γ is a circle.

The following inequality is another version of Bernstein inequality.

Corollary 4.1. *Under the same hypothesis and additional condition $L(\Gamma) \leq 2\pi$,*

$$A \leq 2\pi \left(1 - \sqrt{1 - R^2}\right),$$

equality holds if and only if Γ is a circle, where $R = \frac{L(\Gamma)}{2\pi}$.

In fact, any circle in S with Euclidian radius R divides the sphere into two spherical disks with areas $2\pi\left(1 \pm \sqrt{1 - R^2}\right)$. The following result is obtained by Ladó in 1935.

Theorem 4.2 (Ladó [5])**.** *Any closed curve in S with length less than 2π is contained in some open hemisphere.*

Corollary 4.2. *Let l be a given positive number with*

$$\pi < l < \sqrt{2}\pi,$$

let l_1 and l_2 be positive numbers with

$$l_1 + l_2 = l \text{ and } l_j \geq \frac{\pi}{2}, j = 1, 2,$$

and, for $j = 1, 2$, let γ_j be a circular path in S such that γ_j has endpoints $\{0, 1\}$, $L(\gamma_j) = l_j$, and $\gamma = \gamma_1 + \gamma_2$ is a Jordan curve that encloses a domain D_γ in some hemisphere of S. Then the area of D_γ assumes the maximum if and only if $l_1 = l_2 = \frac{1}{2}l$ and D_γ is convex.

By this corollary, D_γ assume the maximum if and only D_γ is congruent with the domain D_l defined in Section 1.

Proof. This follows from Corollary 4.1 and Theorem 4.2 directly. Let Γ_1 be a circle passing through 0 and 1 in S so that the length of the section α_1 of Γ_1 from 0 to 1 is $\frac{l}{2}$ and Γ_1 is convex in the sense that the disk inside Γ_1 is contained in some open hemisphere of S. Then by the assumption, we have $L(\alpha_1) < L(\Gamma_1 \backslash \alpha_1)$, and then there is a point $p \in \Gamma_1 \backslash \alpha_1$ so that the section α_2 of Γ_1 from 1 to p has length $\frac{l}{2}$ as well.

We replace α_j with γ_j' so that γ_j' is congruent with $\gamma_j, j = 1, 2$, and that the circle Γ_1 becomes a Jordan curve Γ_2 that is convex everywhere, except at $0, 1$ and p, in the sense that the triangle $\overline{0, 1, p, 0}$ is inside the closure of the domain inside Γ_2. It is clear that $L(\Gamma_1) = L(\Gamma_2) < 2\pi$, and thus by Theorem 4.2, Γ_j is contained in some hemisphere S_j of $S, j = 1, 2$. Then by Theorem 4.1 $A_{\Gamma_1} \geq A_{\Gamma_2}$, the equality holds if and only if Γ_2 is a circle, where A_{Γ_j} is the area enclosed by Γ_j in $S_j, j = 1, 2$. From this, the conclusion follows. ☐

Lemma 4.1. *Let* $l < 2\pi$ *be a positive number and let* $l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n$ *be nonnegative numbers with*

$$0 \leq l_1 \leq l_2 \leq \cdots \leq l_n \text{ and } l_1 + l_2 + \cdots + l_n = l.$$

Then

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n}\left(2\pi - \sqrt{(2\pi)^2 - l_k^2}\right) \leq 2\pi - \sqrt{(2\pi)^2 - l^2},$$

the equality holds if and only if $l_1 = \cdots = l_{n-1} = 0$ *and* $l_n = l$.

Proof. There is a standard way in calculus to prove this. In fact, it also follows from Bernstein's inequality and Ladó's theorem directly. □

Theorem 4.3. *Let* $f : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ *be a normal mapping such that*

$$L(f, \partial\Delta) < 2\pi.$$

Then

$$A(f, \Delta) \leq A(D_f) = \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - R_f^2}}{R_f} L(f, \partial\Delta) < L(f, \partial\Delta) \tag{4.1}$$

with $R_f = \frac{L(f,\partial\Delta)}{2\pi}$ *and* D_f *is a disk in some open hemisphere of* S *with* $L(\partial D_f) = L(f, \partial\Delta)$.

If, in addition, $L(f, \partial\Delta) \geq \sqrt{2}\pi$, *then*

$$4\pi + A(f, \Delta) < 4L(f, \partial\Delta). \tag{4.2}$$

Proof. We first show that

$$A(f, \Delta) \leq 2\pi - \sqrt{4\pi^2 - (L(f, \partial\Delta))^2}. \tag{4.3}$$

We may assume that

(a) The boundary curve $\Gamma_f = f(z), z \in \partial\Delta$, has finitely many multiple points, i.e. there is a finite set $Q \subset \partial\Delta$, such that f restricted to $(\partial\Delta) \setminus Q$ is injective.

If (a) fails, we may conside the restriction $f_1 = f|_{\overline{D}}$ of f to some closed Jordan domain $\overline{D} \subset \overline{\Delta}$, such that the boundary curve

$$\Gamma_{f_1} = f_1(z) = f(z), z \in \partial D,$$

of f_1 satisfies (a), while $|A(f, \Delta) - A(f_1, D)|$ and $|L(f, \partial\Delta) - L(f_1, \partial D)|$ may be made arbitrarily small. Then we prove (4.3) for f_1, which implies (4.3) for f.

By Theorem 4.2, $f(\partial\Delta)$ is contained in some open hemisphere S' of S, and then $f(\partial\Delta) \cap (S \setminus S') = \emptyset$. If $f(\Delta) \cap (S \setminus S') \neq \emptyset$, then, since f is normal and a normal mapping is an open mapping, it is clear that $S \setminus S' \subset f(\Delta)$, which implies that $f(\Delta) \cap E \neq \emptyset$ (recall that $E = \{0, 1, \infty\}$), for $S \setminus S'$ is a closed hemisphere of S and a closed hemisphere of S must contain at least one point of E. But this contradicts that f is a normal mapping. Thus, the followings holds.

(b) $f(\overline{\Delta})$ is contained in S'.

For each positive integer j, let Δ_j be the set that for each point $p \in \Delta_j$, $f(z) = p$ has at least j solutions in Δ, counted with multiplicities. Since f is normal, there exists a positive integer n such that n is the largest number with $\Delta_n \neq \emptyset$. Then

$$A(f, \Delta) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} A(\Delta_j), \tag{4.4}$$

and by (a), considering that f is a normal mapping, it is clear that for any pair $\{j,k\}$ with $j\neq k$, $(\partial\Delta_j)\cap(\partial\Delta_k)$ is a finite set and

$$L(f,\partial\Delta)=\sum_{j=1}^{n}L(\partial\Delta_j). \tag{4.5}$$

For each $j\leq n$, Δ_j is a union of finitely many components $\Delta_{jk}, k=1,2,\dots,k_j$, each of which is a domain also contained in S' (by (b)) and is enclosed by a finite number of polygonal Jordan curves. For each j and each $k\leq k_j$, Let Δ_{jk}^* be the domain which is the complement of the component of $S\backslash\Delta_{jk}$ in S that contains $\partial S'$. Then Δ_{jk}^* is a polygonal Jordan domain with

$$\partial\Delta_{jk}^*\subset\partial\Delta_{jk} \text{ but } \Delta_{jk}^*\supset\Delta_{jk},$$

and then by Corollary 4.1 we have

$$A(\Delta_{jk})\leq A(\Delta_{jk}^*)\leq 2\pi-\sqrt{4\pi^2-L(\partial\Delta_{jk}^*)^2}\leq 2\pi-\sqrt{4\pi^2-L(\partial\Delta_{jk})^2},$$

i.e.

$$A(\Delta_{jk})\leq 2\pi-\sqrt{4\pi^2-L(\partial\Delta_{jk})^2},$$

for each $j\leq n$ and each $k\leq k_j$. Then, by Lemma 4.1 we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\sum_{k=1}^{k_j}A(\Delta_{jk}) &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{n}\sum_{k=1}^{k_j}(2\pi-\sqrt{4\pi^2-L(\partial\Delta_{jk})^2})\\ &\leq 2\pi-\sqrt{4\pi^2-\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n}\sum_{k=1}^{k_j}L(\partial\Delta_{jk})\right)^2},\end{aligned}$$

the second equality holds if and only if $n=1$ and $\Delta_1=f(\Delta)$. By (4.4) and (4.5), considering that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n}A(\Delta_j)=\sum_{j=1}^{n}\sum_{k=1}^{k_j}A(\Delta_{jk}),$$

and

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n}L(\partial\Delta_j)=\sum_{j=1}^{n}\sum_{k=1}^{k_j}L(\partial\Delta_{jk}),$$

we have (4.3).

Let $R_f=\frac{L(f,\partial\Delta)}{2\pi}$. Then by (4.3), considering that $R_f<1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}A(f,\Delta) &\leq 2\pi(1-\sqrt{1-R_f^2})\\ &= \frac{1-\sqrt{1-R_f^2}}{R_f}L(f,\partial\Delta)\\ &< L(f,\partial\Delta),\end{aligned}$$

and (4.1) is proved.

On the other hand, under the additional assumption $L(f,\partial\Delta)\geq\sqrt{2}\pi$, we have $\frac{4\pi}{L(f,\partial\Delta)}\leq 2\sqrt{2}$, and then by (4.1), we have

$$A(f,\Delta)+4\pi<L(f,\partial\Delta)+4\pi\leq\left(1+2\sqrt{2}\right)L(f,\partial\Delta)<4L(f,\partial\Delta).$$

This completes the proof. □

Corollary 4.3. *Let $f : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ be a normal mapping such that f maps the diameter $I = [-1, 1]$ of $\overline{\Delta}$ homeomorphically onto the line segment $\gamma = \overline{0,1}$ in S and*

$$L(f, \partial\Delta) < \sqrt{2}\pi. \tag{4.6}$$

Then

$$A(f, \Delta) \leq A(D_l),$$

where D_l is the convex Jordan domain in S which is contained in the spherical disk in S with diameter $\overline{0,1}$ and is enclosed by the two circular arcs in S, each of which has endpoints $\{0, 1\}$ and length $l = \frac{1}{2}L(f, \partial\Delta)$.

Remark 4.1. *The domain D_l defined here is congruent with the domain D_l defined in Section 1 and the convexity of D_l is ensured by (4.6).*

Proof. This follows from Corollaries 4.2 and Theorem 4.3. Without loss of generality, we assume that the orientation of $f([-1, 1]) \subset S$ is from 0 to 1.

Let

$$\alpha^+ = \{z \in \partial\Delta; \mathrm{Im} z \geq 0\},\ \alpha^- = \{z \in \partial\Delta; \mathrm{Im} z \leq 0\},$$
$$\Delta^+ = \{z \in \Delta; \mathrm{Im} z > 0\},\ \Delta^- = \{z \in \Delta; \mathrm{Im} z < 0\}.$$

Then by (4.6) there uniquely exists a circle C in S passing through 0 and 1 such that the interior $\overline{0,1}^{\circ}$ of $\overline{0,1}$ is contained in the disk K enclosed by C and the section c_1 of C from 1 to 0 has length $L(f, \alpha^+)$. Then, by the assumption, it is clear that

$$L(c_1) = L(f, \alpha^+) \geq \frac{\pi}{2}.$$

If $f(\alpha^+) = \frac{\pi}{2}$, then by the assumption we have $f(\partial\Delta^+) = \overline{0,1}$, and then $f(\Delta^+)$ must contains ∞, for normal mappings are open mappings. But this contradicts the assumption that f is normal and as a normal mapping $f(z) \neq 0, 1, \infty$ for all $z \in \Delta$. Thus we have $L(f, \alpha^+) > \frac{\pi}{2}$, which implies

$$L(\partial K) = L(C) < 2\pi. \tag{4.7}$$

Thus $\overline{0,1} + c_1$ encloses a Jordan domain D_1 and $D_2 = K \backslash \overline{D_1}$ is also a Jordan domain.

We may extend $f|_{\overline{\Delta^+}}$ to be a continuous mapping $F : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ such that F restricted to $\overline{\Delta^-}$ is a homeomorphism onto $\overline{D_2}$ and restricted to α^- is a homeomorphism onto $C \backslash c_1$. Then, we have

$$L(F, \partial\Delta) = L(f, \alpha^+) + L(F, \alpha^-) = L(c_1) + L(C \backslash c_1) = L(C),$$

which, with (4.7), implies

$$L(F, \partial\Delta) = L(\partial K) = L(C) < 2\pi. \tag{4.8}$$

F is not a normal mapping, and so we can not apply Theorem 4.3 to F directly. But by (4.8) we can apply Theorem 4.3 to a normal mapping g so that $|L(g, \partial\Delta) - L(F, \partial\Delta)|$ and $|A(g, \Delta) - A(F, \Delta)|$ can be made arbitrarily small, and finally obtain

$$A(F, \Delta) \leq A(D_F), \tag{4.9}$$

where D_F is a disk in some hemisphere of S with

$$L(\partial D_F) = L(F, \partial\Delta). \tag{4.10}$$

F is not normal just because the boundary curve $\Gamma_F = F(z), z \in \partial\Delta$, is not polygonal. Since $F(\alpha^+) = f(\alpha^+)$ is already polygonal, $F(\alpha^-) = C\backslash c_1$ and $\partial\Delta = \alpha^+ \cup \alpha^-$, the mapping g mentioned above can be obtained by restricting F to a domain $\Delta_g \subset \Delta$ with $\Delta_g \supset \Delta^+$.

By (4.8) and (4.10) we have $L(\partial D_F) = L(\partial K)$, which implies $A(D_F) = A(K)$. Thus, by (4.9) we have

$$A(F, \Delta) \leq A(K).$$

Therefore, by the facts $A(K) = A(D_1) + A(D_2)$ and $A(F, \Delta) = A(f, \Delta^+) + A(D_2)$ we have $A(f, \Delta^+) \leq A(D_1)$.

Similarly, we can show that $A(f, \Delta^-) \leq A(D_1')$, where D_1' is the convex domain in some hemisphere of S and is enclosed by $\overline{1,0}$ and the circular arc c_2 from 0 to 1 with $L(c_2) = L(f, \alpha^-)$. Then $\gamma = c_1 + c_2$ encloses a Jordan domain D_γ with $A(D_\gamma) = A(D_1) + A(D_1')$ and

$$A(f, \Delta) \leq A(D_1) + A(D_1') = A(D_\gamma),$$

and by Corollary 4.2, the desired result follows. This completes the proof. □

Let α be a circular path in the upper half plane $\mathrm{Im}z \geq 0$ from 1 to 0 and let $\mathfrak{A}_\alpha$ be the domain in $\mathbb{C}$ enclosed by α and the interval $[0, 1]$ and assume $L(\alpha) \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\pi$, which means that α is contained in the closed half-disk

$$\{z \in \mathbb{C};\ \mathrm{Im}z \geq 0 \text{ and } |z - \frac{1}{2}| < \frac{1}{2}\}.$$

Then

$$\frac{\pi}{2} \leq L(\alpha) \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\pi.$$

We want to find the relation between the spherical length $L(\alpha)$ and the spherical area $A(\mathfrak{A}_\alpha)$. We will show that both $L(\alpha)$ and $A(\mathfrak{A}_\alpha)$ is a real analytical function of

$$\tau = \sin\theta_a, 0 \leq \theta_\alpha \leq \frac{\pi}{2}.$$

where θ_α is the value of the angle between α and the interval $[0, 1]$ at 0.

Lemma 4.2. *In the above setting, we have*

$$L(\alpha) = \zeta_0(\tau) := \frac{2}{\sqrt{1+\tau^2}}(\frac{\pi}{2} - \arctan\frac{\sqrt{1-\tau^2}}{\sqrt{1+\tau^2}}), \tau \in [0, 1], \tag{4.11}$$

and

$$A(\mathfrak{A}_\alpha) = \zeta_1(\tau) := 2\arcsin\tau - \tau\zeta_0(\tau), \tau \in [0, 1]. \tag{4.12}$$

Proof. Let $c_\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ be the center of the circle containing α. Then $\mathrm{Re}c_\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$, and since $L(\alpha) \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\pi$, $\mathrm{Im}c_\alpha \leq 0$. Let $d_\alpha = 2c_\alpha$. Then the triangle in $\mathbb{C}$ with vertices $0, 1$ and d_α is a right-angled triangle and θ_α is the value of the angle at d_α.

It is clear that

$$|d_\alpha| = \frac{1}{\sin\theta_\alpha}.$$

On the other hand, for any point $z \in \alpha$, it is clear that

$$|z| = \sin(\theta_\alpha - t)|d_\alpha|,$$

where $t = \arg z$. Then we obtain a parameter expression of the circular path α:

$$\alpha = \alpha(t) = \frac{\sin(\theta_\alpha - t)}{\sin\theta_\alpha}e^{it}, t \in [0, \theta_\alpha],$$

Then we have

$$|d\alpha(t)| = \frac{|-e^{it}\cos(\theta_\alpha - t) + ie^{it}\sin(\theta_\alpha - t)|}{\sin\theta_\alpha}dt = \frac{dt}{\sin\theta_\alpha},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
L(\alpha) &= \int_\alpha \frac{2|dz|}{1+|z|^2} = \int_0^{\theta_\alpha} \frac{2|d\alpha(t)|}{1+|\alpha(t)|^2} \\
&= \int_0^{\theta_\alpha} \frac{2\sin\theta_\alpha}{\sin^2\theta_\alpha + \sin^2(\theta_\alpha - t)}dt \\
&= \int_0^{\theta_\alpha} \frac{2\sin\theta_\alpha}{\sin^2\theta_\alpha + \sin^2 x}dx \\
&= \frac{2}{\sqrt{1+\sin^2\theta_\alpha}}\left(\frac{\pi}{2} - \arctan\frac{\sqrt{1-\sin^2\theta_\alpha}}{\sqrt{1+\sin^2\theta_\alpha}}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

and we have (4.11).

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
A(\mathfrak{A}_\alpha) &= \iint\limits_{\mathfrak{A}_\alpha} \frac{4dxdy}{(1+|z|^2)^2} \\
&= \int_0^{\theta_a} dt \int_0^{|\alpha(t)|} \frac{4rdr}{(1+r^2)^2} = 2\int_0^{\theta_a}\left(1 - \frac{1}{1+|\alpha(t)|^2}\right)dt \\
&= 2\theta_\alpha - 2\int_0^{\theta_a} \frac{dt}{1+|\alpha(t)|^2} \\
&= 2\theta_a - 2\int_0^{\theta_a} \frac{\sin^2\theta_\alpha dx}{\sin^2\theta_\alpha + \sin^2 x} \\
&= 2\theta_a - \sin\theta_\alpha L(\alpha),
\end{aligned}$$

and we have (4.12). □

It is clear from the geometrical sense that the function

$$\zeta_0(\tau) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{1+\tau^2}}\left(\frac{\pi}{2} - \arctan\frac{\sqrt{1-\tau^2}}{\sqrt{1+\tau^2}}\right), \tau \in [0,1]$$

is an injective mapping.

Corollary 4.4. *Let $f : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ be a normal mapping such that f maps the diameter $[-1,1]$ of $\overline{\Delta}$ homeomorphically onto the line segment $\overline{0,1}$ in S and*

$$L(f, \partial\Delta) < \sqrt{2}\pi.$$

Then

$$A(f,\Delta) \le 2\zeta_1(\tau) = 4\arcsin\tau - 2\tau\zeta_0(\tau),$$

where $\tau = \zeta_0^{-1}(\frac{1}{2}L(f,\partial\Delta))$.

Proof. This follows from Lemma 4.2 and Corollary 4.3 directly. □

Theorem 4.4. *Let $f : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ be a normal mapping such that f maps the diameter $[-1,1]$ of $\overline{\Delta}$ homeomorphically onto the interval $[0,1]$ in S and*

$$L(f, \partial\Delta) < \sqrt{2}\pi.$$

Then

$$4\pi + A(f,\Delta) \leq h_0 L(f,\partial\Delta),$$

where h_0 *is given by (1.3), i.e.*

$$h_0 = \max_{\tau\in[0,1]}\left[\frac{\sqrt{1+\tau^2}\,(\pi+\arcsin\tau)}{\operatorname{arccot}\frac{\sqrt{1-\tau^2}}{\sqrt{1+\tau^2}}} - \tau\right].$$

Proof. Let $\tau = \zeta_0^{-1}(\frac{1}{2}L(f,\partial\Delta))$. Then

$$L(f,\partial\Delta) = 2\zeta_0(\tau)$$

and by Corollary 4.4.

$$A(f,\Delta) \leq 2\zeta_1(\tau).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} 4\pi + A(f,\Delta) &\leq 4\pi + 2\zeta_1(\tau) \\ &= \frac{4\pi + 2\zeta_1(\tau)}{L(f,\partial\Delta)} L(f,\partial\Delta) \\ &= \frac{4\pi + 2\zeta_1(\tau)}{2\zeta_0(\tau)} L(f,\partial\Delta) \\ &= \frac{2\pi + \zeta_1(\tau)}{\zeta_0(\tau)} L(f,\partial\Delta) \leq h_0 L(f,\partial\Delta), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} h_0 &= \max_{\tau\in[0,1]} \frac{2\pi+\zeta_1(\tau)}{\zeta_0(\tau)} = \max_{\tau\in[0,1]} \frac{2\pi + 2\arcsin\tau - \tau\zeta_0(\tau)}{\zeta_0(\tau)} \\ &= \max_{\tau\in[0,1]}\left[\frac{2\pi + 2\arcsin\tau}{\frac{2}{\sqrt{1+\tau^2}}\left(\frac{\pi}{2} - \arctan\frac{\sqrt{1-\tau^2}}{\sqrt{1+\tau^2}}\right)} - \tau\right] \\ &= \max_{\tau\in[0,1]}\left[\frac{\sqrt{1+\tau^2}\,(\pi+\arcsin\tau)}{\operatorname{arccot}\frac{\sqrt{1-\tau^2}}{\sqrt{1+\tau^2}}} - \tau\right]. \end{aligned}$$

□

5. Locally convex polygonal paths and curves in the Riemann sphere

The goal of Sections 5–7 is to prove Theorem 7.1, which is the second key step to prove the main theorem.

In this section we prove some results about locally convex polygonal Jordan paths and curves, which is used in Sections 6 and 7.

It is clear that a generic convex triangle[11] in S is contained in some open hemisphere of S, and then we have the followings.

Lemma 5.1. *Let* $T \subset S$ *be a triangle domain inside*[12] *a generic convex triangle* $\overline{q_1q_2q_3q_1}$ *in* S*. Then for any* $q \in T$*, the notation* $\overline{q_1qq_3q_1}$ *makes sense and denotes a generic convex triangle.*

The following result is easy to see.

---

[11] See Definition 2.11.

[12] By definition, "inside" means "on the left hand side of".

Lemma 5.2. *For any polygonal convex Jordan curve Γ in S and any natural edge*[13] *l of Γ, the domain inside Γ is contained in the open hemisphere of S which is inside the great circle determined*[14] *by l.*

Lemma 5.3. *Let $\Gamma=\Gamma(z), z\in\partial\Delta$, be a polygonal Jordan curve in S.*

(i) If Γ is convex and contains a pair of antipodal points, then Γ is a biangle, and moreover, if in addition Γ has a straight edge with length $>\pi$, then Γ is a great circle of S.

(ii) If Γ is convex and has at least three vertices in the usual sense, i.e. Γ can be expressed as

$$\Gamma=l_1+l_2+\cdots+l_m, m\geq 3,$$

where each l_j is a straight edge[15] *of Γ whose endpoints are both strictly convex vertices of Γ, $j=1,2,\ldots,m$; then for each j, $j=1,2,\ldots,m$,*

$$L(l_j)<\pi \tag{5.1}$$

and for the great circle C_{l_j} in S determined by l_j,

$$\Gamma\cap C_{l_j}=l_j, \tag{5.2}$$

and therefore, Γ is contained in some open hemisphere of S.

Proof. Assume that Γ has a pair of antipodal points q_1 and q_2. We show that the section Γ' of Γ from q_1 to q_2 is straight.

For any natural edge e of Γ', by Lemma 5.2, q_1 and q_2 are both contained in the closed hemisphere inside the great circle C_e determined by e, and thus q_1 and q_2 are both contained in C_e. By the arbitrariness of e, Γ' must be a straight path from q_1 to q_2. For the same reason, we can show that $\Gamma\backslash\Gamma'$ is also a straight path. Thus, Γ is a biangle, which implies the second conclusion of (i), and (i) is proved.

Now, we prove (ii). It is clear that (i) implies (5.1) directly, for otherwise Γ is a biangle which contains at most two edges in the usual sense. So we may write

$$\Gamma=\overline{q_1q_2}+\overline{q_2q_3}+\cdots+\overline{q_mq_1}, m\geq 3,$$

where $l_j=\overline{q_jq_{j+1}}$ with $q_{m+1}=q_1$.

We denote by C_{l_m}, C_{l_1} and C_{l_2} the great circles in S determined by $l_m=\overline{q_mq_1}, l_1=\overline{q_1q_2}$ and $l_2=\overline{q_2q_3}$, and denote by D_{l_m}, D_{l_1} and D_{l_2} the domains inside C_{l_m}, C_{l_1} and C_{l_2}, respectively. Then, q_m and q_3 must be both contained in D_{l_1}, since, by the assumption, Γ is strictly convex at q_1 and q_2; and then, it is clear that $K=\overline{D_{l_m}}\cap\overline{D_{l_1}}\cap\overline{D_{l_2}}$ is a closed triangle domain whose three angles are all strictly less than π, and then K has a vertex in D_{l_1} and

$$l_1=\overline{q_1q_2}=K\cap C_{l_1}.$$

On the other hand, it is clear that $\Gamma\cap C_{l_1}\supset l_1$ and, by Lemma 5.2, $K\supset\Gamma$. Therefore, we have (5.2) for $j=1$. This completes the proof. □

---

[13] By definition, natural edges are oriented by the polygonal curve.

[14] This means that the great circle contains l and is oriented by l.

[15] Note that the interior of l_j may contain points in E, and so l_j may not be a natural edge of Γ, by the definition of natual edges.

Lemma 5.4. *Let Γ be a locally convex polygonal Jordan path with initial and terminal point at q_1. Assume Γ has the following natural partition*[16]

$$\Gamma = \overline{q_1q_2} + \overline{q_2q_3} + \cdots + \overline{q_mq_1}, m \geq 3, \tag{5.3}$$

such that

$$\overline{q_1q_2\ldots q_m} \cap [0, +\infty] = \{q_1\}. \tag{5.4}$$

Then the followings hold.

(i) For each $j = 1, \ldots, m-2$, $L_j = \overline{q_1q_{j+1}q_{j+2}q_1}$ is a generic convex triangle.

(ii) The closure $\overline{T_\Gamma}$ of the domain T_Γ inside Γ is contained in some open hemisphere of S.

(iii) For each triangle domain T_j inside the triangle L_j,

$$T_j \cap T_k = \emptyset, 1 \leq j < k \leq m-2,$$

and

$$\overline{T_\Gamma} = \cup_{j=1}^{m-2}\overline{T_j}.$$

Remark 5.1. *(1). Condition (5.4) is used just to ensure that each vertex $q_j, j = 2, 3, \ldots, m$, of Γ is a* strictly *convex vertex. Thus, (5.4) can be replaced by the condition that Γ is strictly convex at $q_2, \ldots, q_m$. By Definition 2.9, (5.4) can also be replaced by*

$$\{q_2, \ldots q_m\} \cap E = \emptyset,$$

which, with the assumption that Γ is locally convex, implies that Γ is strictly convex at $q_2, \ldots, q_m$.

(2). The reader should notice that (5.3) makes sense if and only if $d(q_j, q_{j+1}) < \pi$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, m-1$, by the appointment.

(3). By conclusion (ii), in the case that $\overline{q_mq_1} + \overline{q_1q_m}$ is straight, we have $L(\overline{q_{m-1}q_m} + \overline{q_mq_1}) < \pi$. Thus if we regard Γ as a closed polygonal Jordan curve, each edge, in the usual sense, of Γ has length $< \pi$, and thus, each natural edge of Γ has length $< \pi$.

Proof. We regard Γ as a closed curve. Then Γ is locally convex everywhere, with at most one exceptional point at q_1.

Let T_Γ be the polygonal domain inside Γ. Then, it is easy to see that there is a path l in $\overline{T_\Gamma}$ from q_1 to some point $q' \in \Gamma$ such that the followings hold.

(a) $l \cap \overline{q_sq_{s+1}}^\circ = \{q'\}$ for some natural edge $\overline{q_sq_{s+1}}$ of Γ, where $\overline{q_sq_{s+1}}^\circ$ is the interior of $\overline{q_sq_{s+1}}$ (if $s = m$, $q_{s+1} = q_1$).

(b) The interior of l is in the domain T_Γ.

(c) l divides the angle Θ_{q_1} of the polygonal domain T_Γ at q_1 into two angles, each of which has value $< \pi$.

By the fact that any two distinct straight lines in the sphere S only intersect at a pair of antipodal points, and that (5.3) implies $L(\overline{q_1q_2}) < \pi$ and $L(\overline{q_mq_1}) < \pi$, we have that

$$l \cap \overline{q_1q_2} = l \cap \overline{q_mq_1} = \{q_1\}, \tag{5.5}$$

which implies

$$2 \leq s \leq m-1. \tag{5.6}$$

---

[16] By definition, here "locally convex" means that for each $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m-1$, $\overline{q_jq_{j+1}q_{j+2}}$ is a convex path from q_j to q_{j+2}. So, as a closed curve, Γ may not be convex at q_1, i.e., $\overline{q_mq_1q_2}$ may not be a convex path.

It is easy to see from (a)–(c) that

$$\Gamma_1 = \overline{q_1 q_2 \dots q_s q'} - l$$

is strictly convex at q_1 and q', and then by (5.4) and the assumption that Γ is a locally convex path and that $q_2, \dots, q_m$ are the all natural vertices, Γ_1 is a polygonal convex Jordan curve that is strictly convex at all points $q_1, \dots, q_s, q'$. On the other hand, since Γ is simple, by (5.5) and (5.6) we conclude that q_1, q_2 and q' are distinct each other. Therefore, Γ_1 is a convex polygonal Jordan curve that has at least three strictly convex vertices, and thus, by Lemma 5.3 (ii), $\Gamma_1 \backslash \overline{q_s q'}$ is contained in the open hemisphere S' inside the great circle determined by $\overline{q_s q_{s+1}} \supset \overline{q_s q'}$, and for the same reason,

$$\Gamma_2 = \overline{q' q_{s+1} \dots q_m q_1} + l$$

is also a convex polygonal Jordan curve that has at least three strictly convex vertices and $\Gamma_2 \backslash \overline{q' q_{s+1}}$ is also contained in S'. Thus, $\Gamma \backslash \overline{q_s q_{s+1}}$ is contained in S', and, considering that $L(\overline{q_s q_{s+1}}) < \pi$, we have proved (ii).

(i) follows from (ii) and the convexity of Γ_1 and Γ_2; and (iii) follows from (i) and (ii) directly. This completes the proof. □

In the rest of this section we assume that γ_0 is a locally convex polygonal Jordan path that has the natural partition

$$\gamma_0 = \overline{q_1 q_2} + \overline{q_2 q_3} + \dots + \overline{q_{m-1} q_m}, m \geq 3, \tag{5.7}$$

with

$$\gamma_0 \cap [0, +\infty] = \{q_1, q_m\}. \tag{5.8}$$

Then $q_2, \dots, q_{m-1}$ are natural vertices of γ_0, at which γ_0 is convex, and none of $q_2, \dots, q_{m-1}$ is contained in E. Thus, by Definitions 2.7 and 2.9 we have that

(a) γ_0 is strictly convex at all its natural vertices, the points $q_2, \dots, q_{m-1}$.

Lemma 5.5. *Assume $q_1 \neq q_m$ and let $I_{q_1 q_m}$ be the section of $[0, +\infty]$ from q_1 to q_m. Then the followings hold.*

(i) $\Gamma = \gamma_0 - I_{q_1 q_m}$ is a polygonal Jordan curve that is convex everywhere, with at most one exceptional point at q_1 or q_m.

(ii) $L(I_{q_1 q_m}) < \pi$, and Γ and the closure $\overline{T_\Gamma}$ of the domain T_Γ enclosed by

$$\Gamma = \gamma_0 - I_{q_1 q_m} = \gamma_0 + \overline{q_m q_1}$$

is contained in some open hemisphere of S.

(iii) If, in addition, $q_1 = 0$, then Γ is strictly convex at q_m.

Proof. It is clear that $\Gamma = \gamma_0 - I_{q_1 q_m}$ is simple, and by (a) we have

(b) $q_2, \dots, q_{m-1}$ are strictly convex vertices of Γ.

Thus the possible nonconvex vertices of Γ are q_1 and q_m. We show that Γ is convex at q_1 or q_m. We assume the contrary that both q_1 and q_m are nonconvex vertices and without loss of generality, we assume

$$q_1 < q_m. \tag{5.9}$$

Then we have[17]

---

[17] Note that under this contrary assumption, Γ does not go straight at q_1, nor at q_m, but turn right at both q_1 and q_m. On the other hand, $\overline{q_1 q_2}, \overline{q_{m-1} q_m}$ make sense if and only if $d\{q_1, q_2\} < \pi$ and $d\{q_{m-1}, q_m\} < \pi$. Thus, $\overline{q_1 q_2} \cap C_{1m} = \{q_1\}$ and and $\overline{q_{m-1} q_m} \cap C_{1m} = \{q_m\}$, which, with the assumption $q_1 < q_m$, implies (c).

(c) Both q_2 and q_{m-1} are contained in the open hemisphere S' inside the great circle C_{1m} determined by $I_{q_1q_m}$.

Then by (5.8), $I_{q_1q_m}$ has a neighborhood J_1 in the great circle C_{1m} determined by $I_{q_1q_m}\subset[0,+\infty]$ such that $J_1^\circ\supset[0,+\infty]$ and $J_1\backslash I_{q_1q_m}\subset T_\Gamma$, where T_Γ is the domain inside Γ and J_1° is the interior of J_1.

It is clear that there are only two cases need to discuss:

Case 1. $C_{1m}\cap\Gamma=I_{q_1q_m}$.

Case 2. $(C_{1m}\cap\Gamma)\backslash I_{q_1q_m}\neq\emptyset$.

Assume Case 1 occurs. Then $C_{1m}\cap\gamma_0=\{q_1,q_m\}$, and for the section[18] $I'_{q_mq_1}$ of C_{1m} from q_m to q_1, by (5.9) and (c) we conclude that

$$\Gamma'=\gamma_0+I'_{q_mq_1}$$

is a Jordan curve that is strictly convex at q_1 and q_m, and then by (a) and Remark 2.5 we can conclude that Γ' is a convex polygonal Jordan curve in S and is strictly convex at $q_1,\dots,q_m$, and thus we have by Lemma 5.3 that $L(I'_{q_mq_1})<\pi$, but on the other hand

$$L(I'_{q_mq_1})=L(C_{1m})-L(I_{q_1q_m})\geq 2\pi-L([0,+\infty])=\pi,$$

which is a contradiction. Thus, Case 1 can not occur, and then, Case 2 must occur.

Then, we can extend the path J_1 past both sides to be a longer path J from q' to q'' such that

(d) $\{q',q''\}\subset\Gamma,$ J is oriented by $I_{q_1q_m}$, the interior of the section of J from q' to q_1 and the interior of the section of J from q_m to q'' are both contained in T_Γ.

Then

$$L(J)>\pi, \tag{5.10}$$

for $J\supset J_1^\circ\supset[0,+\infty]$.

We first show that $q'\neq q''$. We assume the contrary that $q'=q''$. Then it is clear that q' is in the interior γ_0° of γ_0 and, by (d), we have

$$C_{1m}\cap\gamma_0^\circ=\{q'\}. \tag{5.11}$$

Then, by (c), (5.11) and the fact that γ_0 is simple and connected, we have

$$\gamma_0^\circ\backslash\{q'\}\subset S'. \tag{5.12}$$

Since $q'\neq q_1,q_m$, γ_0 is convex at q' by the assumption. Then by (5.12), γ_0 is strictly convex at q', and thus the domain T_Γ is a polygonal Jordan domain with an angle at q' strictly less than π. But by (d) and the assumption $q'=q''$, $J\backslash I_{q_1q_m}$ is a neighborhood of q' in C_{1m} and $(J\backslash I_{q_1q_m})\backslash\{q'\}\subset T_\Gamma$. This is a contradiction. Thus, $q'\neq q''$.

Let γ_0' be the section of γ_0 from q' to q''. Then

$$\Gamma'=\gamma_0'-J$$

is a polygonal Jordan curve that is strictly convex at q' and q'', for γ_0 is a locally convex path, $\{q',q''\}\subset\gamma_0'\subset\gamma_0^\circ$, q' and q'' have neighborhoods in J contained in T_Γ. Thus, Γ' is convex everywhere by the assumption on γ_0, and then Γ' is convex by Remark 2.5, and then by (5.10) and Lemma 5.3 (i), Γ' is a great circle, which is a contradiction since Γ' strictly convex at q'.

---

[18] Recall that, by the appointment, a section of a curve inherits the orientation of the curve, and so $I'_{q_mq_1}$ is the complementary of $I^\circ_{q_1q_m}$ in C_{1m}.

Summarizing the above argument, we can conclude that Γ must be convex at q_1 or q_m, and (i) is proved.

To prove the inequality in (ii), assume the contrary, that is, $L(I_{q_1q_m}) \geq \pi$. Then

$$q_1 = 0 \text{ and } q_m = \infty,$$

and so $L(I_{q_1q_m}) = \pi$. Without loss of generality, by (i), we may assume that

(e) $\Gamma = \gamma_0 - I_{q_1q_m}$ is convex at $q_1 = 0$.

If Γ is also convex at q_m, then Γ is a convex curve in S, and then by Lemma 5.3 (i), Γ is a biangle with vertices 0 and ∞, and then $[0, +\infty]$ and γ_0 should be the two straight edges of the biangle Γ; but by (b) this is a contradiction.

We first assume that Γ is not convex at q_m. Then we can extend $I_{q_1q_m}$ past q_m to obtain a longer line segment J' from q_1 to q' so that

$$q' \in \gamma_0 \text{ and } (J' \backslash I_{q_1q_m}) \backslash \{q'\} \subset T_\Gamma. \tag{5.13}$$

If $q' = q_1$, then we have $J' = C_{1m}$ and then

$$J' \backslash I_{q_1q_m} = C_{1m} \backslash [0, +\infty] \subset T_\Gamma. \tag{5.14}$$

But on the other hand, by (e), $\overline{q_1q_2} \backslash \{q_1\}$ is either contained in the open hemisphere $S \backslash \overline{S'}$ outside C_{1m}, or $\overline{q_1q_2} \subset C_{1m}$. Then, in the case $q' = q_1$, we have $\overline{q_1q_2} \backslash \{q_1\} \subset S \backslash \overline{S'}$ by (5.14), and then $q' = q_1$ has a neighborhood in J' that is outside T_Γ, which contradicts (5.14). Thus, $q' \neq q_1$.

Then $-J'$ and the segment of γ_0 from q_1 to q' compose a polygonal Jordan curve Γ', and Γ' is strictly convex at q', since $J' \backslash I_{q_1q_m}$ intersects Γ at q' from the left hand side of Γ, by (5.13), and Γ is convex at $q' (\neq q_1, q_m)$. Hence, by (b) and (e), Γ' is locally convex polygonal Jordan curve with the straight edge $-J'$ with $L(J') > \pi$, which implies that Γ' is a great circle in S by Lemma 5.3 (i). But this contradicts that Γ' is strictly convex at q', and we obtain a contradiction again.

Summarizing the above discussion, we have proved

$$L(I_{q_1q_m}) < \pi, \tag{5.15}$$

the inequality in (ii). Then, we can write $-I_{q_1q_m} = -\overline{q_1q_m} = \overline{q_mq_1}$, and

$$\Gamma = \overline{q_1q_2} + \overline{q_2q_2} + \dots \overline{q_{m-1}q_m} + \overline{q_mq_1}.$$

Now we prove that Γ is contained in some open hemisphere of S.

If $\{q_1, q_m\} \subset (0, \infty)$, then by (5.8), neither q_2, nor q_{m-1} can lie in C_{1m} and thus by (i) Γ is strictly convex at q_1 or q_m.

Assume $q_1 = 0$. Then, by (5.15), $q_m \in (0, \infty)$ and by (5.8)

$$q_{m-1} \notin C_{1m}. \tag{5.16}$$

If Γ is not convex at 0, then by (i) and by (5.8), Γ is strictly convex at q_m. If Γ is straight near q_1, then $\overline{q_1q_2} \subset C_{1m}$ and by (b), $\overline{q_2q_3} \backslash \{q_2\} \subset S \backslash \overline{S'}$, and then we can extend $\overline{q_3q_2}$ past q_2 to a point q_2' so that $\overline{q_3q_2'}$ makes sense and $\overline{q_1q_2'q_3}$ is still strictly convex at q_2'. Then the curve $\gamma_0^* = \overline{q_1q_2'q_3 \dots q_m}$ satisfies all the assumptions of γ_0 but the curve $\Gamma^* = \gamma_0^* - I_{q_1q_m}$ is not convex at q_1, and thus by (i) and (5.16) Γ^* is strictly convex at q_m. But Γ^* and Γ coincide near q_m, and thus Γ is strictly convex at q_m. If $q_m = \infty$, the discussion is similar.

Summarizing the above discussion, we can conclude that Γ is strictly convex at q_1 or q_m, and thus, by (b), either $\overline{q_1q_2 \dots q_mq_1}$, or $\overline{q_mq_1 \dots q_{m-1}q_m}$, is a locally convex path that is strictly convex at each natural vertices, and then $\Gamma = \overline{q_1q_2 \dots q_mq_1}$ is contained in some open hemisphere of S. The second part of (ii) is proved, and (ii) is proved completely.

Now, assume $q_1 = 0$. Then $q_m \in (0,+\infty)$ by the assumption and (ii). Thus, by the assumption, q_{m-1} is either contained in the open hemisphere S' inside the great circle determined by $[0,+\infty]$, or $q_{m-1} \in S\backslash\overline{S'}$. If $q_{m-1} \in S'$, then Γ is not convex at q_m and the open interval of the great circle C determined by $[0,+\infty]$ from q_m to ∞ is contained in T_Γ, and then we can obtain a contradiction as the above argument involving J'. Thus $q_{m-1} \in S\backslash\overline{S'}$, i.e. Γ is strictly convex at q_m, and (iii) is proved. □

Lemma 5.6. *If* $q_1 = 0$ *and* $q_m \in (0,+\infty)$, *then for each* $j = 1,\ldots,m-2$, $L_j = \overline{q_1 q_{j+1} q_{j+2} q_1}$ *is a generic convex triangle and for the triangle domain* T_j *inside* L_j,

$$T_j \cap T_k = \emptyset, 1 \le j < k \le m-2,$$
$$\overline{T_j} \cap [0,+\infty] = \{0\}, \text{ for } j = 1,\ldots,m-3,$$
$$\overline{T_{m-2}} \cap [0,+\infty] = \overline{q_m q_1}.$$

Proof. By (b) in the above proof and by Lemma 5.5 (ii) and (iii),

$$\Gamma = \gamma_0 + \overline{q_m q_1} = \overline{q_1 q_2} + \overline{q_2 q_3} + \cdots + \overline{q_{m-1} q_m} + \overline{q_m q_1}$$

is contained in some open hemisphere of S and is strictly convex at $q_2,\ldots,q_m$. Then by Lemma 5.4 (iii) and Remark 5.1 (1), the conclusion follows. □

Lemma 5.7. *If* q_2 *is contained in the open hemisphere* S' *inside the great circle* C *determined by* $[0,+\infty]$, q_{m-1} *is contained in* $S\backslash\overline{S'}$, *and if*

$$\{q_1, q_m\} \subset (0,+\infty), \tag{5.17}$$

then the followings hold.

(i) $\Gamma = \gamma_0 + \overline{q_m q_1} = \overline{q_1 q_2 \ldots q_m q_1}$ *is a Jordan curve such that* 0 *is contained in the domain* T_Γ *inside* Γ.

(ii) For $q_0 = 0$ *and* $j = 1,\ldots,m-1$, $L_j = \overline{q_0 q_j q_{j+1} q_0}$ *is a generic convex triangle; and for the triangle domain* T_j *inside* L_j,

$$\overline{T_j} \cap [0,+\infty] = \{0\}, \text{ for } j = 2,\ldots,m-2,$$
$$\overline{T_1} \cap [0,+\infty] = \overline{q_0 q_1},\ \overline{T_{m-1}} \cap [0,+\infty] = \overline{q_m q_0}.$$

Proof. For any point q_1' that is in the interior of $\overline{q_1 q_2}$ and is sufficient close to q_1, by the assumption of the lemma, the polygonal curve

$$\gamma_0' = \overline{0 q_1' q_2 \ldots q_m} = \overline{0 q_1'} + \cdots + \overline{q_{m-1} q_m}$$

is a locally convex Jordan path and satisfies the assumption on γ_0 just with more edges, then applying Lemma 5.6 to γ_0' and taking $q_1' \to q_1$, we can obtain (i) and (ii). □

Lemma 5.8. *If*

$$\{q_1, q_m\} \subset (0,+\infty), \tag{5.18}$$

and

$$\{q_2, q_{m-1}\} \subset S', \tag{5.19}$$

where S' *is the open hemisphere inside the great circle determined by* $[0,+\infty]$, *then the curve* $\Gamma = \gamma_0 + \overline{q_m q_1} = \overline{q_1 q_2 \ldots q_m q_1}$ *is a convex polygonal Jordan curve,* $q_m \le q_1$ *and* Γ *is strictly convex at* $q_j, j = 1,2,\ldots,m$.

Proof. We first assume $q_1 = q_m$. Then

$$\Gamma = \gamma_0 = \overline{q_1q_2} + \cdots + \overline{q_{m-1}q_1}$$

is a locally convex Jordan path, and then $m \geq 4$ and, by (a), Γ is strictly convex at $q_2, \ldots, q_{m-1}$, and considering that in this case, (5.8) is reduced to (5.4), we can conclude by Lemma 5.4 that the closure $\overline{T_\Gamma}$ of the domain T_Γ enclosed Γ is contained in some open hemisphere of S. On the other hand, by (5.8), (5.18) and (5.19) and the assumption that $q_1 = q_m$, it is easy to see that, if $\overline{q_{m-1}q_1q_2}$ is not convex at q_1, then $[0, +\infty]\backslash\{q_1\}$ will be contained in T_Γ, and then T_Γ can not be contained in any open hemisphere of S. This is a contradiction. Thus, by (5.18) and (5.19), Γ is strictly convex at q_1, and then by (a), Γ is strictly convex at $q_j, j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$.

Now, we assume $q_1 \neq q_m$. Then by Lemma 5.5, Γ is convex at q_1 or q_m. If $q_1 < q_m$, then Γ is neither convex at q_1, nor at q_m. Thus, we must have $q_m < q_1$. Then, by (5.18) and (5.19), Γ is strictly convex at q_1 and q_m, and then by (a), Γ is strictly convex at $q_j, j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$. □

6. LIFTING LEMMAS FOR NORMAL MAPPINGS

In this section, we prove Theorem 6.1 that is used to prove Theorem 7.1. Theorem 7.1 is the second key step to prove the main theorem.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $f : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ be a normal mapping and let D be a polygonal Jordan domain in S such that f^{-1} has a univalent branch*[19] *g defined on D. Then g can be extended to be a homeomorphism $\widetilde{g}$ from $\overline{D}$ onto $\widetilde{g}(\overline{D})$.*

Proof. There is a simple and standard way to prove this by Lemma 3.3. □

The following result is obvious but useful.

Lemma 6.2. *Let D_1 and D_2 be Jordan domains in $\mathbb{C}$ and let $f : \overline{D_1} \to \overline{D_2}$ be a mapping such that $f : \overline{D_1} \to f(\overline{D_1})$ is a homeomorphism. If $f(\partial D_1) \subset \partial D_2$, Then $f(\overline{D_1}) = \overline{D_2}$.*

Lemma 6.3. *Let p_1 and p_2 be two distinct points in $\partial\Delta$, let α be the section*[20] *of $\partial\Delta$ from p_1 to p_2 and let β be a Jordan path in $\overline{\Delta}$ from p_2 to p_1 such that α and β have a common point p_0 with $p_0 \neq p_1, p_2$. Assume that $f : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ is a normal mapping such that the followings hold.*

(a) The curve $\Gamma_\alpha = f(z), z \in \alpha$, and $\Gamma_\beta = f(z), z \in \beta$, are polygonal paths and are both convex at p_0.

(b) f is regular[21] *at p_0.*

Then p_0 has a neighborhood β' in β such that $\beta' \subset \alpha \subset \partial\Delta$ and f restricted to β' is a line segment in S.

Proof. By the assumption, p_0 has a neighborhood α'' in α and a neighborhood β'' in β, such that the curves $f(\alpha'')$ and $f(\beta'')$ intersect "tangently".

□

---

[19] "univalent branch" always means that the branch is a homeomorphism.

[20] Recall that $\partial\Delta$ is always orientated anticlockwise, and a section of a curve inherits the orientation of the curve.

[21] This means that f is homeomorphic in a neighborhood of p_0.

Lemma 6.4. *Let* $p_j = e^{i\theta_j}$ *be a number of* m *distinct points in* $\partial\Delta$ *with*

$$\theta_1 < \theta_2 < \cdots < \theta_m < \theta_1 + 2\pi,$$

let α_j *be the section of* $\partial\Delta$ *from* p_j *to* $p_{j+1}, j = 1, \dots, m-1$, *let* $f : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ *be a normal mapping and let*

$$q_j = f(p_j), j = 1, \dots m. \tag{6.1}$$

Assume that the followings hold.

(a) The section

$$\Gamma_0 = f(z), z \in \alpha_0 = \alpha_1 + \cdots + a_m$$

of the boundary curve $\Gamma_f = f(z), z \in \partial\Delta$, *is a polygonal Jordan path and each section* $\Gamma_j = f(\alpha_j)$ *of* Γ_0 *is a natural edge of* Γ_0 *with*

$$L(\Gamma_j) < \pi, j = 1, \dots, m. \tag{6.2}$$

(b) $L_j = \overline{q_1 q_{j+1} q_{j+2} q_1}, j = 1, \dots, m-2$, *are generic convex triangles in* S, *the triangle domains* T_j *enclosed by* L_j *are disjoint each other, and*

$$\Gamma = \Gamma_0 + \overline{q_m q_1}$$

is a polygonal Jordan curve.

(c) For the domain T *enclosed by* Γ, f *has no branched point in* $\overline{T} \backslash \overline{q_m q_1}$.

(d) The boundary curve $\Gamma_f = f(z), z \in \partial\Delta$, *is locally convex in* T.

Then, the followings hold true.

(i) f^{-1} *has a univalent branch* g *defined on* $\overline{T}$ *such that* g *maps* $\Gamma_0 = \overline{q_1 q_2 \dots q_m}$ *onto* $\alpha_0 = \alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_{m-1}$ *with* $g(q_j) = p_j, j = 1, 2, \dots, m$.

(ii) If in addition, for some open *interval* γ *of* $\overline{q_m q_1}$, f *has no branched point in* γ *and* $\Gamma_f = f(z), z \in \partial\Delta$, *is locally convex in* γ, *then either* $g(\gamma) \subset \partial\Delta$ *or* $g(\gamma) \subset \Delta$.

We first prove the following lemma under the same assumption as that in Lemma 6.4. Note that by (6.1) and (6.2), we can write

$$\Gamma_j = \overline{q_j q_{j+1}}, j = 1, 2, \dots, m-1.$$

Lemma 6.5. *(i).* f^{-1} *has a univalent branch* g_1 *defined on* $\overline{T_1}$, *such that* g_1 *restricted to* $\overline{q_1 q_2 q_3}$ *is a homeomorphisms onto* $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2$ *with* $g_1(q_j) = p_j, j = 1, 2, 3$.

(ii). If $m > 3$, *then* $\beta_1 = g_1(\overline{q_1 q_3})$ *is a Jordan path in* $\overline{\Delta}$ *from* p_1 *to* p_3 *and the interior of* β_1 *is contained in* Δ.

(iii). If $m = 3$ *and for some* open *interval* γ *contained* $\overline{q_m q_1}$, f *has no branched point in* γ *and* $\Gamma_f = f(z), z \in \partial\Delta$, *is locally convex in* γ, *then either* $g(\gamma) \subset \partial\Delta$ *or* $g(\gamma) \subset \Delta$.

Proof. Write $c_0 = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2$, $\gamma_0 = \Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2 = \overline{q_1 q_2 q_3}$ and $\gamma_1 = \overline{q_1 q_3}$.

Let v_1 be an interior point of $\gamma_1 = \overline{q_1 q_3}$ and let $v = v_s = v(s)$, $s \in [0, 1]$, be a Jordan path that represents the straight path from q_2 to v_1 in the closed triangle domain $\overline{T_1}$ enclosed by the triangle $L_1 = \overline{q_1 q_2 q_3 q_1} = \gamma_0 - \gamma_1$. Then, by (b) and Lemma 5.1, for each $s \in (0, 1)$, the polygonal Jordan path $\gamma_s = \overline{q_1 v_s q_3}$ in $\overline{T_1}$ is strictly convex at v_s, and $\gamma_s, s \in [0, 1]$, is a family of curves exhausting the closed domain $\overline{T_1}$ and satisfying the following condition (e).

(e) For each $s \in (0, 1]$, the domain T_s inside $\gamma_0 - \gamma_s$ is a (spherical) quadrilateral domain contained in T_1 and for any pair $s_1, s_2 \in (0, 1]$ with $s_1 < s_2$,

$$T_{s_1} \cup (\gamma_{s_1} \backslash \{q_1, q_3\}) = \overline{T_{s_1}} \backslash \gamma_0 \subset T_{s_2}.$$

Since f is normal, by the definition, there exists a point q_1' in the interior of $\Gamma_1 = \overline{q_1 q_2}$ and there exists a point q' in the domain T_1 such that f^{-1} has a univalent branch defined on the closure of the triangle domain inside the triangle $\overline{q_1 q_1' q' q_1} \subset \overline{T_1}$ and this branch restricted to $\overline{q_1 q_1'}$ is a homeomorphism onto a section of α_1 from p_1 to some interior point of α_1. At q_3 we can do this similarly. On the other hand, considering that $\overline{q_1 q_2 q_3}$ is simple and f is a normal mappings, by (b) and (c), we can conclude that for each q_0 contained in the interior[22] of $\gamma_0 = \Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2 = \overline{q_1 q_2 q_3}$, there exists a disk V_{q_0} in S such that f^{-1} has a univalent branch defined on $V_{q_0} \cap \overline{T_1}$ and this branch maps $\gamma_0 \cap V_{q_0}$ onto a section of c_0. Summarizing these discussion, we conclude that, for sufficiently small $\delta > 0$, δ satisfies the following property:

(f) f^{-1} has a univalent branch g_δ defined on $\overline{T_\delta}$ with

$$g_\delta(q_j) = p_j, j = 1, 2, 3,$$

g_δ restricted to $\gamma_0 = \overline{q_1 q_2 q_3}$ is a homeomorphism onto $c_0 = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2$ and $c_\delta = g_\delta(\gamma_\delta)$ is a Jordan path from p_1 to p_3 whose interior is contained in Δ.

If δ satisfies (f) and $\delta < 1$, then $c_0 - c_\delta$ is a Jordan curve, the domain $\widetilde{\Delta}_\delta$ inside $c_0 - c_\delta$ is a Jordan domain, $\overline{\Delta} \backslash \widetilde{\Delta}_\delta$ is a closed Jordan domain[23] and f restricted $\overline{\Delta} \backslash \widetilde{\Delta}_\delta$ is a normal mapping (note that $f(\partial(\overline{\Delta} \backslash \widetilde{\Delta}_\delta))$ is polygonal). In this case, replacing $\overline{\Delta}$ by $\overline{\Delta} \backslash \widetilde{\Delta}_\delta$, c_0 by c_δ, γ_0 by γ_δ and applying the above argument once more, we can also prove the following property for δ :

(g) For each $\delta \in (0, 1)$, if δ satisfies (f), then for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, $\delta + \varepsilon$ satisfies (f) as well.

On the other hand, it is clear that, if δ satisfies (f), then each positive number $\delta' < \delta$ satisfies (f) as well. Thus, for

$$\delta_0 = \sup\{\delta \in (0, 1);\ \delta \text{ satisfies (f)}\},$$

we have

(h) Each $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$ satisfies (f).

To show $\delta_0 = 1$, we first show that δ_0 satisfies (f) if $\delta_0 < 1$.

By (e), (f) and (h), f^{-1} has a univalent branch $\widetilde{g}_{\delta_0}$ defined on $T_{\delta_0} \cup \gamma_0$. By Lemma 6.1, $\widetilde{g}_{\delta_0}$ can be extended to be a homeomorphism g_{δ_0} defined on $\overline{T_{\delta_0}}$. Thus, γ_{δ_0} has a lift $c_{\delta_0} = g_{\delta_0}(w), w \in \gamma_{\delta_0}$, by f, and c_{δ_0} is a Jordan path from p_1 to p_3 in $\overline{\Delta}$. Let $\overline{\widetilde{\Delta}}_{\delta_0} = g_{\delta_0}(\overline{T_{\delta_0}})$, then f restricted to $\overline{\widetilde{\Delta}}_{\delta_0}$ is a homeomorphism onto $\overline{T_{\delta_0}}$, and maps c_{δ_0} onto γ_{δ_0}.

Now, we show that the following hold.

(j) If $\delta_0 < 1$, then the interior of c_{δ_0} is contained in Δ.

Assume $\delta_0 < 1$ and let $p_0 \in c_{\delta_0}$ be any interior point of c_{δ_0} with $p_0 \in \partial\Delta$. Then $p_0 \in \alpha := (\partial\Delta) \backslash c_0$ and $f(p_0)$ is in the interior of γ_{δ_0}, and then $f(p_0) \in T_1$. Thus, by (d), the curves $\Gamma_\alpha = f(z), z \in \alpha = (\partial\Delta) \backslash c_0$, and $\Gamma_\beta = f(z), z \in \beta = c_{\delta_0}$, are both convex at p_0 (note that Γ_β is the path γ_{δ_0}). Therefore, by (c) and Lemma 6.3, p_0 has a neighborhood β' in $\beta = c_{\delta_0}$ such that $\beta' \subset \alpha = (\partial\Delta) \backslash c_0$ and $f(\beta')$ is straight. But then, with a continuation argument, we can prove that the whole of $f(c_{\delta_0})$ is also straight, which contradicts the fact that $\gamma_{\delta_0} = f(c_{\delta_0})$ is not straight if $\delta_0 < 1$. Thus, the interior of c_{δ_0} must be in Δ and (j) is proved.

---

[22] Note that the interior of γ_0 does not intersects $\overline{q_m q_1}$, and thus f has no branched point in the interior of γ_0.

[23] By (f), α_δ divides Δ into two Jordan domains.

(j) implies that δ_0 satisfies (f) if $\delta_0 < 1$. This, with (g), implies that if $\delta_0 < 1$, then $\delta_0 + \varepsilon$ satisfies (f) for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$. This contradicts the definition of δ_0. Thus we have proved $\delta_0 = 1$.

Now that $\delta_0 = 1$, by (e)–(h), f^{-1} has a univalent branch $\widetilde{g}_1$ defined on $T_1 \cup \gamma_0$, and by Lemma 6.1, $\widetilde{g}_1$ can be extended to be a homeomorphism g_1 defined on $\overline{T_1}$. Thus, (i) holds. (ii) can be proved as the proof of (j), by (i) and Lemma 6.3, and (iii) can be proved similarly. □

Proof of Lemma 6.4. If $m = 3$, then Lemma 6.4 follows from (i) and (iii) of Lemma 6.5. So we may assume $m \geq 4$. But, without loss of generality, we complete the proof only for the case $m = 4$.

We continue the proof of Lemma 6.5. Let $\beta_1 = g_1(\overline{q_1q_3})$. Then by Lemma 6.5 (ii), $\beta_1^\circ \subset \Delta$, where β_1° is the interior of β_1. Then β_1 divides Δ into two Jordan domains. We denote by Δ_1 the component of $\Delta\backslash\beta_1$ that is on the left hand side of β_1, i.e. $\Delta_1 = \Delta\backslash g_1(\overline{T_1})$.

Then, by the assumption $m = 4$, Δ_1 is enclosed by

$$\beta_1 + \alpha_3 + \alpha^*$$

where α^* is the section of $\partial\Delta$ from $p_m = p_4$ to p_1.

Again by (a)–(d) and Lemma 6.5 (i), f^{-1} has a univalent branch g_2 defined on $\overline{T_2}$ such that $g_2 : \overline{T_2} \to g_2(\overline{T_2})$ is a homeomorphism, restricted to $\overline{q_1q_3q_4}$ is a homeomorphism onto $\beta_1 + \alpha_3$ and

$$g_2(q_j) = p_j, j = 1, 3, 4.$$

Since f has no branched point in $\overline{T}\backslash\overline{q_4q_1}$ (note that $m = 4$), f has no branched point on $\overline{q_3q_1}\backslash\{q_1\}$. Thus, g_1 and g_2 must be identical on $\overline{q_3q_1}$. Then g_1 and g_2 make up a univalent branch g of f^{-1}, such that $g : \overline{T} = \overline{T_1 \cup T_2} \to g(\overline{T})$ is a homeomorphism with $g(\overline{q_1q_2q_3q_4}) = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3$. (i) is proved.

(ii) can be proved as the proof of (j). This completes the proof of Lemma 6.4. □

Remark 6.1. *Lemma 6.4 implies an interesting proposition: let* $f : \overline{\Delta} \to \mathbb{C}$ *be an open mapping that is orientation preserved and is locally homeomorphism. Then,* f *is a homeomorphism, provided that the boundary curve* $\Gamma_f = f(z), z \in \partial\Delta$, *is locally convex.*

Here "locally convex" means that when z *goes around* $\partial\Delta$ *anticlockwise,* $f(z)$ *always go straight or turn left. For example, if we assume that the curve* Γ_f *is smooth and is locally straight, or locally on the left hand side of its tangent line, then* Γ_f *is locally convex.*

For later use, we only prove this in a special version for normal mappings, which is the following corollary.

Corollary 6.1. *Let* α_0 *be a section of* $\partial\Delta$ *from* p_1 *to* p_m *with*

$$p_1 \neq p_m, \tag{6.3}$$

let $f : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ *be a normal mapping such that the section* $\gamma_0 = f(z), z \in \alpha_0$, *is a closed Jordan path that has the natural partition*

$$\gamma_0 = \overline{q_1q_2} + \overline{q_2q_3} + \cdots + \overline{q_{m-1}q_1}, \tag{6.4}$$

with $q_1 = f(p_1) = f(p_m)$ *and*

$$\{q_2, \ldots, q_{m-1}\} \cap E = \emptyset.$$

Assume that for the domain $T_{\gamma_0} \subset S$ *enclosed by* γ_0*, the boundary curve* $\Gamma_f = f(z), z \in \partial\Delta$*, is locally convex in* $\overline{T_{\gamma_0}} \backslash \{q_1\}$*. Then* f *has a branched point in* $\overline{T_{\gamma_0}} \backslash \{q_1\}$*.*

Proof. Since γ_0 is a closed Jordan path, by (6.4) we have[24] $m \geq 4$. Since Γ_f is locally convex in $\overline{T_{\gamma_0}} \backslash \{q_1\}$, γ_0 is a locally convex path, and then by Lemma 5.4 and Remark 5.1 (1), for each $j = 1, \ldots, m-3$, $L_j = \overline{q_1 q_{j+1} q_{j+2} q_1}$ is a generic convex triangle such that the triangle domains T_j enclosed by L_j are disjoint each other and $\overline{T_{\gamma_0}} = \cup_{j=1}^{m-3} \overline{T_j}$.

Assume f has no branched point in $\overline{T_{\gamma_0}} \backslash \{q\}$. Then, Lemma 6.4 applies, i.e. f^{-1} has a univalent branch g defined on $\overline{T_{\gamma_0}}$ such that g restricted to $\overline{q_1 q_2 \ldots q_{m-1}}$ is a homeomorphism onto a section α_0' of α_0 from p_1 to some point $p_{m-1}' \in \alpha_0^\circ$, here α_0° is the interior $\alpha_0 \backslash \{p_1, p_2\}$ of α_0.

Let α_0'' be the section of α_0 from p_{m-1}' to p_m, then, by the assumption, it is clear that f maps α_0'' homeomorphically onto $\overline{q_{m-1} q_m} = \overline{q_{m-1} q_1}$. Since f has no branched point on $\overline{T_{\gamma_0}} \backslash \{q_1\}$ and $q_{m-1} \in \overline{T_{\gamma_0}} \backslash \{q_1\}$, after an argument of uniqueness of the lifting, we have $g(\overline{q_{m-1} q_1}) = \alpha_0'' \subset \partial\Delta$. Then we have $g(\gamma_0) \subset \partial\Delta$, and then $g(\gamma_0) = \partial\Delta$ by Lemma 6.2. Thus f is a homeomorphism, and γ_0 is the whole curve Γ_f, which contradicts (6.3). The proof is completed. □

In the rest of this section, let $p_j = e^{i\theta_j}$ be m distinct points in $\partial\Delta, j = 1, \ldots, m$, with

$$m \geq 3 \text{ and } \theta_1 < \theta_2 < \cdots < \theta_m \leq \theta_1 + 2\pi,$$

let α_j be the section of $\partial\Delta$ from p_j to $p_{j+1}, j = 1, \ldots, m-1$, and let

$$\alpha_0 = \alpha_1 + \alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_{m-1}.$$

Definition 6.1. *The family* $\mathcal{F}_m$ *is defined to be the family of all normal mappings* $f : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ *that satisfies all the following conditions (A)–(E).*

(A) The section $\gamma_0 = f(z), z \in \alpha_0$*, of the boundary curve* $\Gamma_f = f(z), z \in \partial\Delta$*, is a Jordan path.*

(B) γ_0 *has the natural partition*

$$\gamma_0 = \overline{q_1 q_2} + \overline{q_2 q_3} + \cdots + \overline{q_{m-1} q_m}, \tag{6.5}$$

with

$$\gamma_0 \cap [0, +\infty] = \{q_1, q_m\}, \tag{6.6}$$

where, $q_j = f(p_j)$*,* $j = 1, \ldots, m$*, and* $\overline{q_j q_{j+1}}$ *is the section*

$$\Gamma_j = f(z), z \in \alpha_j, j = 1, \ldots, m-1.$$

(C) The boundary curve $\Gamma_f = f(z), z \in \partial\Delta$*, is locally convex in* $S \backslash \{0, \infty\}$*.*

(D) f *has no ramification point in* $\overline{\Delta}$*.*

(E) $f(\Delta) \cap [0, +\infty] = \emptyset$*.*

Each $f \in \mathcal{F}_m$ will be endowed with all the notations in the definition. By (A) and (B) the curve

$$\Gamma = \gamma_0 + \overline{q_m q_1} \tag{6.7}$$

is a polygonal Jordan curve. Here it is permitted that $q_1 = q_m$, and in this case $\Gamma = \gamma_0$.

Note that by (A), (B), (C) and Definition 2.9, we have

---

[24] Note that (6.11) makes sense iff each term on the right hand side has spherical length $< \pi$.

(F) γ_0 is a locally convex polygonal Jordan path that is strictly convex at $q_2, \dots, q_{m-1}$.

Then by (B) and Lemma 5.5 (ii), $\overline{q_m q_1}$ in (6.7) makes sense. On the other hand, if $q_1 = q_m$, then, by (A) and (6.5), $m \geq 4$. Therefore, by Lemma 5.4 (for the case $q_1 = q_m$ here) and Lemma 5.5 (for the case $q_1 \neq q_m$) the following holds true.

(G) The closure $\overline{T_\Gamma}$ of the domain T_Γ enclosed by $\Gamma = \gamma_0 + \overline{q_m q_1}$ is contained in some open hemisphere of S.

Theorem 6.1. *Let $f \in \mathcal{F}_m$ and denote by T_Γ the domain enclosed by Γ. Then the followings hold.*

(i) The restriction $f|_\Delta : \Delta \to T_\Gamma \backslash [0, +\infty]$ is a homeomorphism. (ii) $f(\overline{\Delta})$ is contained in some open hemisphere of S.

(iii) For $\alpha_0^\circ = \alpha_0 \backslash \{p_1, p_m\}$,

$$f(\alpha_0^\circ) \cap [0, +\infty] = \emptyset, \tag{6.8}$$

$$f((\partial\Delta) \backslash \alpha_0^\circ) \subset [0, +\infty], \tag{6.9}$$

and

$$L(f, \alpha_0) > L(f, (\partial\Delta) \backslash \alpha_0). \tag{6.10}$$

Proof. By (A) and (B), it is clear that (6.8) holds true. To complete the remained proof, it suffices to consider three cases.

Case 1.

$$0 = q_1 \leq q_m < +\infty. \tag{6.11}$$

If $q_1 = q_m = 0$, then by (G) we have

$$\overline{T_\Gamma} \cap [0, +\infty] = \{0\},$$

and then by (C), (D) and Corollary 6.1 we have $p_1 = p_m$, and then, by (A), f maps $\alpha_0 = \partial\Delta$ homeomorphically onto the closed Jordan curve $\Gamma = \gamma_0$, and since f is normal we conclude that $f : \Delta \to T_\Gamma = T_\Gamma \backslash [0, +\infty]$ is a homeomorphism, and other conclusions of Theorem 6.1 is trivially hold with $\alpha_0 = \partial\Delta$, by (G).

If $q_1 \neq q_m$, i.e. $q_1 = 0$ and $q_m \in (0, +\infty)$, then by Lemma 5.6 the triangles $L_j = \overline{q_1 q_{j+1} q_{j+2} q_1}$ are generic convex for $j = 1, 2, \dots, m-2$, the domains T_j enclosed by L_j are disjoint each other and for the domain T_Γ enclosed by $\Gamma = \gamma_0 + \overline{q_m q_1}$ we have

$$\overline{T_\Gamma} = \cup_j^{m-2} \overline{T_j}, \ 0 \notin \overline{T_\Gamma},$$

and

$$\overline{T_\Gamma} \backslash \overline{q_m q_1} = \overline{T_\Gamma} \backslash \overline{q_m 0} \subset S \backslash \{0, \infty\}.$$

Then, by (C) and (D), Lemma 6.4 applies, and then, f^{-1} has a univalent branch g defined on $\overline{T_\Gamma}$ such that g restricted to γ_0 is a homeomorphism onto α_0. Let $\alpha^* = g(\overline{q_m q_1})$. Then α^* is a Jordan path in $\overline{\Delta}$ from p_m to p_1 and by (E) we have $\alpha^* \subset \partial\Delta$, and then $\alpha^* = (\partial\Delta) \backslash \alpha_0^\circ$. This implies that $g(\partial T_\Gamma) = \partial\Delta$, and then $f : \overline{\Delta} \to \overline{T_\Gamma}$ and $f : \Delta \to T_\Gamma = T_\Gamma \backslash [0, +\infty]$ are homeomorphisms, with

$$f((\partial\Delta) \backslash \alpha_0^\circ) = f(\alpha^*) = \overline{q_m q_1} \subset [0, +\infty],$$

and

$$L(f, \alpha_0) = L(\gamma_0) > L(\overline{q_m q_1}) = L(f, (\partial\Delta) \backslash \alpha_0).$$

Then, by (G), the proof is complete for Case 1.

Case 2.

$$\{q_1, q_m\} \subset (0, +\infty), \tag{6.12}$$

and

$$\{q_2, q_{m-1}\} \subset S', \tag{6.13}$$

where S' is the open hemisphere inside the great circle determined by $[0, +\infty]$.

By (A), (B), (C), (6.12), (6.13) and Lemma 5.8, we have

(H) $\Gamma = \gamma_0 + \overline{q_m q_1}$ is a convex Jordan curve that is strictly convex at all vertices $q_1, q_2, \dots, q_m$.

We first assume $q_1 = q_m$. Then the closed curve $\Gamma = \gamma_0 = \overline{q_1 q_2} + \overline{q_2 q_3} + \cdots + \overline{q_{m-1} q_1}$ is strictly convex at all its vertices $q_1, \dots, q_{m-1}$, and, by Lemma 5.3 (ii)

$$\overline{T_{\gamma_0}} \backslash \{q_1\} \subset S',$$

where T_{γ_0} is the domain enclosed by γ_0. Then by (C), (D) and Corollary 6.1, $\alpha_0 = \alpha_1 + \alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_{m-1} = \partial\Delta$, i.e. $p_1 = p_m$. This implies that f restricted to $\partial\Delta$ is a homeomorphism onto γ_0 and then f is a homeomorphism, and the other conclusions are trivial in this setting.

Now, we assume $q_1 \neq q_m$. Then $\Gamma = \gamma_0 + \overline{q_m q_1}$ has the following natural partition

$$\Gamma = \overline{q_1 q_2} + \overline{q_2 q_3} + \cdots + \overline{q_{m-1} q_m} + \overline{q_m q_1},$$

and by (H) and Lemma 5.3 (ii), $\overline{T_\Gamma} \subset S' \cup \overline{q_m q_1}$, which, with (6.12), implies that

$$\overline{T_\Gamma} \cap \{0, \infty\} = \emptyset \text{ and } \overline{T_\Gamma} \cap [0, +\infty] = \overline{q_m q_1}. \tag{6.14}$$

Then again by (H), the triangles $L_j = \overline{q_1 q_{j+1} q_{j+2} q_1}$ are all generic convex triangles and the domains T_j enclosed by L_j are disjoint each other, and $\overline{T_\Gamma} = \cup_j^{m-2} \overline{T_j}$. By (C) and (6.14), $\Gamma_f = f(z), z \in \partial\Delta$, is locally convex in $\overline{T_\Gamma}$ and by (D), f has no branched point in $\overline{T_\Gamma}$. Thus, by Lemma 6.4, f^{-1} has a univalent branch g defined on $\overline{T_\Gamma}$ such that g maps $\gamma_0 = \overline{q_1 q_2 \dots q_m}$ onto α_0.

Let $\alpha^* = g(\overline{q_m q_1})$. Then α^* is a Jordan path in $\overline{\Delta}$ from p_m to p_1. By (E), we have $\alpha^* \subset \partial\Delta$, and then we have $\alpha^* = \partial\Delta \backslash \alpha_0^{\circ}$ and $g(\partial T_\Gamma) = g(\Gamma) \subset \partial\Delta$, which, with Lemma 6.2, implies that $g(\overline{T_\Gamma}) = \overline{\Delta}$, and then $f : \overline{\Delta} \to \overline{T_\Gamma}$ is a homeomorphism.

Thus $f : \Delta \to T_\Gamma = T_\Gamma \backslash [0, +\infty]$ is a homeomorphism

$$f((\partial\Delta) \backslash \alpha_0) = \overline{q_m q_1} \subset [0, +\infty],$$

and, by the fact that $L(\gamma_0) > L(\overline{q_m q_1})$, we have

$$L(f, \alpha_0) > L(f, \alpha^*) = L(f, (\partial\Delta) \backslash \alpha_0).$$

Then, by (G), The proof is complete for Case 2.

Case 3.

$$\{q_1, q_m\} \subset (0, +\infty), \tag{6.15}$$

and

$$q_2 \in S', q_{m-1} \in S \backslash \overline{S'}. \tag{6.16}$$

By (A), (B), (C), (6.15) and (6.16), Lemma 5.7 apply to γ_0, and then we have the following.

(I) 0 is contained in the domain T_Γ, $L_j = \overline{0 q_j q_{j+1} 0}$ is a generic convex triangle for $j = 1, \dots, m-1$; and for the triangle domain T_j enclosed by L_j,

$$\overline{T_j} \cap [0, +\infty] = \{0\}, \text{ for } j = 2, \dots, m-2,$$

$$\overline{T_1} \cap [0, +\infty] = \overline{0q_1},\ \overline{T_{m-1}} \cap [0, +\infty] = \overline{q_m 0}.$$

By (I), we can extend $\overline{q_1 0}$ past 0 to some point $q' \in \Gamma$ such that the open line segment $\overline{q'0}^{\circ}$ is contained in T_Γ (note that by (G) the notations $\overline{q'0}$ and $\overline{q'q_1} = \overline{q'0} + \overline{0q_1}$ make sense, i.e. $d(q', q_1) < \pi$). By (G) and (I), $\overline{q'q_1}$ divides T_Γ into two polygonal Jordan domains T_1^* and T_2^* with $q_2 \in \partial T_1^*$ and $q_{m-1} \in \partial T_2^*$, both T_1^* and T_2^* are strictly convex at q', T_1^* is on the left hand side of $\overline{q'q_1}$ and T_2^* is on the right hand side of $\overline{q'q_1}$, q_1 is a strictly convex vertex of of T_1^* and q_m is a strictly convex vertex of T_2^*. Thus, by (F), both T_1^* and T_2^* are polygonal convex Jordan domains.

Considering that q', q_1 and q_2 are strictly convex vertices of T_1^*, by Lemma 5.3, we have

$$\overline{T_1^*} \backslash \overline{q'q_1} \subset S'. \tag{6.17}$$

Let γ_1 be the section of γ_0 from q_1 to q', p' the unique point in α_0 such that $f(p') = q'$, α_0^1 the section of α_0 from p_1 to p' and let α_0^2 be the section of α_0 from p' to p_m. We may assume $q' \in \overline{q_s q_{s+1}}^{\circ}$ (in the case $q' = q_s$ or q_{s+1}, the proof is the same). Then

$$\partial T_1^* = \gamma_1 + \overline{q'q_1} = \overline{q_1 q_2} + \cdots + \overline{q_s q'} + \overline{q'q_1},$$

and T_1^* is strictly convex at $q_1, q_2, \ldots, q_s, q'$, and then $\overline{q_1 q_2 q_3 q_1}, \ldots, \overline{q_1 q_{s-1} q_s q_1}$, $\overline{q_1 q_s q' q_1}$ are generic convex triangles that triangulate $\overline{T_1^*}$. Hence, by (C), (D), (6.17), Lemma 6.4 applies to $\overline{T_1^*}$, and then f^{-1} has a univalent branch g_1 defined on $\overline{T_1^*}$ such that g_1 restricted to γ_1 is a homeomorphism onto α_0^1 with

$$g_1(q_1) = p_1 \text{and } g_1(q') = p'.$$

For the same reason, f^{-1} has a univalent branch g_2 defined on $\overline{T_2^*}$ such that g_2 restricted to $\gamma_2 = \overline{q'q_{s+1}} + \cdots + \overline{q_{m-1}q_m}$ is a homeomorphism onto α_0^2 with

$$g_2(q_m) = p_m \text{ and } g_2(q') = p'.$$

Considering that f has no branched point in S and $g_1(q') = g_2(q')$. We have

$$g_1(w) = q_2(w), w \in \overline{q'0}, \tag{6.18}$$

and we denote by $\alpha = g_1(\overline{q'0}) = g_2(\overline{q'0})$. By (E) we have

$$g_1(0) = g_2(0) \in \partial\Delta,$$

and thus, the initial and terminal points of α, the points p' and $g_1(0) = g_2(0)$, are contained in $\partial\Delta$.

Then we can glue g_1 and g_2 along $\overline{q'0}$ to be a multivalent function G such that G restricted to $T_\Gamma \backslash \left(\overline{0q_1} \cap \overline{0q_m}\right)$ is a homeomorphism and restricted to $\overline{T_j^*}$ is the homeomorphism g_j, $j = 1, 2$. Then, it is clear that the interior of $\alpha = g_1(\overline{q'0}) = g_2(\overline{q'0})$ is contained in Δ, and thus α divides Δ into two Jordan domains Δ_1 and Δ_2, and we assume Δ_1 is on the left hand side of α.

Let $\alpha' = g_2(\overline{q_m 0})$ and $\alpha'' = g_1(\overline{0q_1})$. Then by (E), α' is a section of $\partial\Delta$ from p_m to $g_2(0)$ and α'' is a section of $\partial\Delta$ from $g_1(0) = g_2(0)$ to p_1, since $g_1(q_1) = p_1$ and $g_2(q_m) = p_m$. Thus, we can conclude that f maps $\alpha_0, \alpha', \alpha''$ homeomorphically onto $\gamma_0, \overline{q_m 0}, \overline{0q_1}$, respectively, and

$$\partial\Delta = \alpha_0 + \alpha' + \alpha'' \text{with } \alpha_0^{\circ} \cap (\alpha' + \alpha'') = \emptyset.$$

This implies that f maps Δ homeomorphically onto $T_\Gamma \backslash \overline{0q_1} = T_\Gamma \backslash \overline{0q_m}$, since f is normal.

On the other hand, it is clear that $L(\gamma_1) > L(\overline{0q_1})$ and $L(\gamma_2) > L(\overline{q_m0})$. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} L(f,\alpha_0) &= L(f(\alpha_0)) = L(\gamma_0) = L(\gamma_1) + L(\gamma_2) > L(\overline{0q_1}) + L(\overline{q_m0}) \\ &= L(f,\alpha'' + \alpha') = L(f,(\partial\Delta)\backslash\alpha_0). \end{aligned}$$

By (G), $f(\overline{\Delta}) \subset \overline{T_\Gamma}$ is contained in some open hemisphere of S and it is clear that

$$f((\partial\Delta)\backslash\alpha_0^\circ) = \overline{q_m0} \cup \overline{0q_1} \subset [0,+\infty].$$

This completes the proof for Case 3, and we have finally proved Theorem 6.1. $\square$

7. Cutting Riemann surfaces along $[0,+\infty]$

In this section we prove the following theorem, which is the second key step to prove the main theorem in Section 14 and is also used to prove Theorem 13.1. Recall that we denote by $[0,+\infty]$ the line segment in S from 0 to ∞ that passes through 1.

Theorem 7.1. *Let $f:\overline{\Delta}\to S$ be a normal mapping and assume that the followings hold.*

(a) Each natural edge of the boundary curve $\Gamma_f = f(z), z\in\partial\Delta$, has length strictly less than π.

(b) $\Gamma_f = f(z), z\in\partial\Delta$, is locally convex in[25] *$S\backslash E, E=\{0,1,\infty\}$.*

(c) f has no branched point in $S\backslash E$.

(d) $\Gamma_f\cap[0,+\infty]$ contains at most finitely many points.

Then, in the case $\Delta\cap f^{-1}([0,+\infty])=\emptyset$, $f(\overline{\Delta})$ is contained in some open hemisphere of S, $f:\overline{\Delta}\to f(\overline{\Delta})$ is a homeomorphism and

$$(\partial\Delta)\cap f^{-1}([0,+\infty])$$

contains at most one point; and in the case $\Delta\cap f^{-1}([0,+\infty])\neq\emptyset$, the following (i)–(v) hold:

(i) Each component of $f^{-1}([0,+\infty])\cap\Delta$ is a Jordan path with distinct endpoints contained in $\partial\Delta$ and divides Δ into two Jordan domains.

(ii) Any pair of two distinct components of $f^{-1}([0,+\infty])\cap\Delta$ have at most one common endpoint.

(iii) For each component D of $\Delta\backslash f^{-1}([0,+\infty])$, D is a Jordan domain and f restrict to D is a homeomorphism.

(iv) For each component D of $\Delta\backslash f^{-1}([0,+\infty])$, $(\partial D)\cap(\partial\Delta)$ is consisted of a connected open subset α_0 and a number of finite points such that

$$f(\alpha_0)\cap[0,+\infty]=\emptyset \text{ and } f(\partial D\backslash\alpha_0)\subset[0,+\infty],$$

and f restricted to α_0 is a homeomorphism.

(v) For α_0 in (iv), if $\alpha_0\neq\emptyset$, then $f(\overline{D})$ is contained in some hemisphere of S and

$$L(f(\alpha_0)) > L(f,\partial D\backslash\alpha_0),$$

that is

$$L(f,\partial D\cap(\partial\Delta)) > L(f,(\partial D)\backslash(\partial\Delta)).$$

---

[25] See Definition 2.5.

This theorem has very simple geometrical explanation: when we cut the Riemann surface of f along $[0,+\infty]$ in the case

$$\Delta \cap f^{-1}([0,+\infty]) \neq \emptyset,$$

we obtain a finite number of pieces, each of which is either the whole sphere S with folded boundary $[0,+\infty]$, or is contained in some open hemisphere of S such that the length of the boundary located in $S\backslash[0,+\infty]$, which is a part of the original boundary of the Riemann surface of f, is larger than the length of the boundary located in $[0,+\infty]$, which is a part of the the new boundary, the cut edges.

This geometrical understand of the mapping in the theorem plays an important role in this paper. We first prove the following lemma.

Lemma 7.1. *Let $g:\overline{\Delta}\to S$ be a normal mapping that satisfies (a)–(c) of the previous theorem and*

$$g(\Delta) \subset S\backslash[0,+\infty]. \tag{7.1}$$

Then,

(i) g restricted to Δ is a homeomorphism onto $g(\Delta)$.

(ii) $\partial\Delta$ has an open connected subset α_0 of $\partial\Delta$, such that

$$g(\alpha_0)\cap[0,+\infty]=\emptyset \text{ and } g(\partial\Delta\backslash\alpha_0)\subset[0,+\infty].$$

(iii) If in (ii) $\alpha_0\neq\emptyset$, then g restricted to α_0 is a homeomorphism onto the curve $g(\alpha_0)$ in S and $L(g(\alpha_0)) > L(g,\partial\Delta\backslash\alpha_0)$.

(iv) If in (ii), $\alpha_0\neq\emptyset$, then $g(\overline{\Delta})$ is contained in some open hemisphere of S.

Proof. By condition (c) and (7.1) we have

(e) g has no ramification point in $\overline{\Delta}$.

Let p be any point in $\partial\Delta$ such that

$$f(p)=1\in(0,+\infty)\subset S.$$

If $\Gamma_g = g(z), z\in\partial\Delta$, is not convex at p, then, since f is normal, there is an open interval $I\subset(0,+\infty)$ whose one endpoint is 1 such that $I\subset g(\Delta)$, which contradicts (7.1). Thus, Γ_g is convex at[26] 1, and then by (b), we have

(f) Γ_g is locally convex in $S\backslash\{0,\infty\}$.

If $g(\partial\Delta)\cap[0,+\infty]=\emptyset$, then by (f) Γ_g is locally convex everywhere, which implies that Γ_g is locally simple by the definition, and then by Corollary 6.1 and (e), Γ_g is a simple curve and then g is a homeomorphism from $\overline{\Delta}$ onto $g(\overline{\Delta})$. On the other hand, in this case, by (a), (f) and Definition 2.5, Γ_g is a locally convex curve and has at least three natural vertices, at each of which Γ_g is strictly convex. Thus, by Lemma 5.4 (ii), the closure $\overline{T_{\Gamma_g}}$ of the domain T_{Γ_g} enclosed by Γ_g is contained in some open hemisphere of S, and thus, $g(\overline{\Delta})\subset\overline{T_{\Gamma_g}}$ is contained in some open hemisphere of S. Hence, putting $\alpha_0=\partial\Delta$, (i)–(iv) hold.

Consider the case $g(\partial\Delta)\subset[0,+\infty]$. Then $g(\partial\Delta)$ must be a closed interval in $[0,+\infty]$. If $g(\partial\Delta)\neq[0,+\infty]$, then by the fact that g is normal, $g(\Delta)$ contains 0 or ∞, but this contradicts the assumption. Thus, $g(\partial\Delta)=[0,+\infty]$, and then by (7.1), g restricted to Δ is a covering onto $S\backslash[0,+\infty]$, which, together with (e), implies that g restricted to Δ is a homeomorphism, and putting $\alpha_0 = \emptyset$, we have (ii). Then, in the case

---

[26] This means that $\Gamma_g = g(z), z\in\partial\Delta$, is convex at each point $p\in(\partial\Delta)\cap g^{-1}(1)$, by Definition 2.5.

$$g(\partial\Delta) \cap [0,+\infty] = \emptyset \text{ or } g(\partial\Delta) \subset [0,+\infty],$$

the lemma is proved.

Now, we assume that $g(\partial\Delta) \cap [0,+\infty] \neq \emptyset$ and $g(\partial\Delta)\backslash[0,+\infty] \neq \emptyset$.

Then by (a), Γ_g has a section

$$\gamma_0 = \overline{q_1q_2} + \overline{q_2q_3} + \cdots + \overline{q_{m-1}q_m}, m \geq 3, \tag{7.2}$$

such that each $q_2, \ldots, q_{m-1}$ are natural vertices of Γ_g, the edges $\overline{q_2q_3}, \ldots, \overline{q_{m-2}q_{m-1}}$ are natural edges of Γ_g,

$$\left[\{q_2, \ldots, q_{m-1}\} \cup \cup_{j=2}^{m-2}\overline{q_jq_{j+1}}\right] \cap [0,+\infty] = \emptyset \tag{7.3}$$

and

$$\{q_1, q_m\} \subset [0,+\infty] \text{ but } \gamma_0\backslash\{q_1, q_m\} \subset S\backslash[0,+\infty]. \tag{7.4}$$

By (f) and (7.2)–(7.4), γ_0 is locally simple, i.e. $\overline{q_jq_{j+1}} \cap \overline{q_{j+1}q_{j+2}} = \{q_{j+1}\}$ for $j = 1, \ldots, m-2$. Then, by (7.2)–(7.4), in the case that γ_0 is not simple, there exist integers s and t with $1 \leq s < s+1 < t \leq m-1$ and a point

$$q_s' \in (\overline{q_sq_{s+1}} \cap \overline{q_tq_{t+1}}) \backslash\{q_1, q_m\}$$

such that

$$\Gamma' = \overline{q_s'q_{s+1}} + \overline{q_{s+1}q_{s+2}} + \cdots + \overline{q_{t-1}q_t} + \overline{q_tq_s'}$$

is a section of γ_0 that is a simple path from q_s' to q_s', and

$$\Gamma' \cap [0,+\infty] = \emptyset.$$

Therefore, by (f) and Definition 2.9, Γ' is a locally convex Jordan path[27] that is strictly convex at $q_{s+1}, q_{s+2}, \ldots, q_t$, and then, by (a), Γ' has at least three strictly convex vertices. Therefore, by Lemma 5.4 (ii), Γ' is contained in some open hemisphere, which implies that $[0,+\infty] \cap \overline{T_{\Gamma'}} = \emptyset$, where $T_{\Gamma'}$ is the domain inside Γ', and then by (f), $\Gamma_g = g(z), z \in \partial\Delta$, is locally convex in $\overline{T_{\Gamma'}}$. Then, g and Γ' satisfies the assumption of Corollary 6.1, and then g has a branched point in $\overline{T_{\Gamma'}}$, which contradicts (e). Thus we have proved

(g) γ_0 is a Jordan path.

Then $\partial\Delta$ has an open section α_0 such that g restricted to α_0 is a homeomorphism onto γ_0°. Then, by (e), (f), (g), (7.1), (7.2) and (7.4), we have $g \in \mathcal{F}_m$, and Theorem 6.1 applies. Then g restricted to Δ is a homeomorphism onto the domain $T_\Gamma\backslash[0,+\infty] \subset S$, where T_Γ is the domain enclosed by $\Gamma = \gamma_0 + \overline{q_mq_1}$,

$$g((\partial\Delta)\,\backslash\alpha_0) \subset [0,+\infty],$$

$$L(g,\alpha_0) > L(g,(\partial\Delta)\,\backslash\alpha_0),$$

and $g(\overline{\Delta})$ is contained in some open hemisphere of S. Thus, (i)–(v) hold, and the proof is complete. □

---

[27] This does not mean that as a closed curve Γ'' is convex at q_s', by the definition of locally convex path and locally convex closed curves.

Proof of Theorem 7.1. We first assume

$$\Delta \cap f^{-1}([0,+\infty]) = \emptyset. \tag{7.5}$$

Then Lemma 7.1 applies, and then $f : \Delta \to f(\Delta)$ is a homeomorphism, $f(\overline{\Delta})$ is contained in some open hemisphere of S and there exists a connected open subset $\alpha_0 \subset \partial\Delta$ such that

$$f(\alpha_0) \cap [0,+\infty] = \emptyset, \tag{7.6}$$

$$f((\partial\Delta)\setminus\alpha_0) \subset [0,+\infty], \tag{7.7}$$

and f restricted to α_0 is also a homeomorphism onto some curve in S. Then, $(\partial\Delta)\setminus\alpha_0$ is also a connected section of $\partial\Delta$, and f restricted to $\Delta \cup \alpha_0$ is also a homeomorphism.

By (d) and (7.7),

$$f((\partial\Delta)\setminus\alpha_0) \subset f(\partial\Delta) \cap [0,+\infty]$$

is a finite set. Then, since $(\partial\Delta)\setminus\alpha_0$ is connected, $f((\partial\Delta)\setminus\alpha_0)$ is a singleton, or is empty, which implies that $(\partial\Delta)\setminus\alpha_0$ is a singleton, or is empty, which, with (7.6) and the above argument, implies that $(\partial\Delta) \cap f^{-1}([0,+\infty])$ contains at most one point and $f : \overline{\Delta} \to f(\overline{\Delta})$ is a homeomorphism. The theorem is proved under the assumption (7.5).

Now, we assume

$$f(\Delta) \cap [0,+\infty] \neq \emptyset.$$

Then by (c) and (d) and the assumption that f is normal, each component of $f^{-1}([0,+\infty]) \cap \Delta$ is a simple path in Δ whose endpoints are distinct and contained in $\partial\Delta$, i.e. (i) holds true, and $f^{-1}([0,+\infty]) \cap \Delta$ has only a finite number of components. This implies that $\Delta \setminus f^{-1}([0,+\infty])$ has a finite number of components, each of which is a Jordan domain.

(ii) follows from Lemma 3.5.

Let D be any component of $\Delta \setminus f^{-1}([0,+\infty])$. Then by (i), D is a Jordan domain. Let g be the restricted mapping $g = f|_{\overline{D}}$. Then g is a normal mapping and each natural edge of $\Gamma_g = g(z), z \in \partial D$, is either a natural edge of $\Gamma_f = f(z), z \in \partial\Delta$, or a section of some natural edge of Γ_f, or an interval contained in $\overline{0,1}$ or $\overline{1,\infty}$. Thus (a) is satisfied by g. By (b) and (c), g also satisfies (b) and (c), and it is clear that

$$g(D) \cap [0,+\infty] = \emptyset.$$

Thus g satisfies all the assumption of Lemma 7.1, by ignoring a coordinate transform that maps $\overline{D}$ homeomorphically onto $\overline{\Delta}$. Thus, Lemma 7.1 applies to g and (iii) follows. By Lemma 7.1, ∂D has a connected open subset α_0 of ∂D, such that (7.6) and (7.7) still hold.

It is clear, by (7.6) and (7.7), that

$$\alpha_0 = (\partial D) \setminus f^{-1}([0,+\infty]),$$

and, by (i) and (ii), that

$$(\partial D) \cap \Delta \subset f^{-1}([0,+\infty].$$

Then, we have

$$\alpha_0 = ((\partial D)\setminus\Delta) \setminus f^{-1}([0,+\infty]),$$

and, considering that $(\partial D)\setminus\Delta = (\partial D) \cap (\partial\Delta)$, we have

$$\alpha_0 = [(\partial D) \cap (\partial\Delta)] \setminus f^{-1}([0,+\infty]).$$

Then, considering that, by (d), $(\partial\Delta)\cap f^{-1}([0,+\infty])$ is a finite set, we conclude that $(\partial D)\cap(\partial\Delta)\backslash\alpha_0$ is a finite set, and thus α_0 is the interior of $(\partial D)\cap(\partial\Delta)$ in $\partial\Delta$. Therefore, by (7.6) and (7.7), we have (iv).

(v) follows from (iv) and Lemma 7.1. This completes the proof. □

In the above two proofs, we have also proved that:

Corollary 7.1. *Let* $f:\overline{\Delta}\to S$ *be a normal mapping that satisfies all assumptions of Theorem 7.1 and let* Δ_1 *be any component of* $\Delta\backslash f^{-1}([0,+\infty])$. *Then the restriction* $g=f|_{\overline{\Delta_1}}$ *satisfies all the assumptions of Lemma 7.1, and, furthermore, if* $g(\partial\Delta_1)\subset[0,+\infty]$, *then* $g(\partial\Delta_1)=[0,+\infty]$ *and* g *restricted to* Δ_1 *is a homeomorphism onto* $S\backslash[0,+\infty]$.

The condition (d) in Theorem 7.1 may be removed by the following lemma.

Lemma 7.2. *Let* $f:\overline{\Delta}\to S$ *be a normal mapping satisfying the conditions (a)–(c) of Theorem 7.1.*

Then for any $\varepsilon>0$, *there exists a normal mapping* $g:\overline{\Delta}\to S$ *such that*

$$A(g,\Delta)\geq A(f,\Delta),L(g,\partial\Delta)<L(f,\partial\Delta)+\varepsilon,$$

and g *satisfies all conditions (a)–(d) of Theorem 7.1.*

Proof. This can be proved by perturb the natural edges of f lying on $[0,+\infty]$ slightly.

Let Γ_1 be any natural edge of Γ_f such that $\Gamma_1\cap[0,+\infty]$ contains more that one point. Then since Γ_1 is a natural edge, it is either contained in the interval $[0,1]$ in S, or in the interval $[1,\infty]$. Without loss of generality we assume $\Gamma_1\subset[0,1]$ and the orientation of Γ_1 is the same as $\overline{0,1}$. Then there are four cases:

(i) $\Gamma_1=\overline{0,1}$.
(ii) $\Gamma_1=\overline{0,t_0}$ for some $t_0\in(0,1)$.
(iii) $\Gamma_1=\overline{t_0,t_1}$ for some $t_0,t_1\in(0,1)$.
(iv) $\Gamma_1=\overline{t_0,1}$ for some $t_0\in(0,1)$.

In these cases, we can extend the Riemann surface of f by patching a closed triangle domain along Γ_1 so that the vertex p_1' is very close the middle point of Γ_1 and is on the right hand side of Γ_1. By Lemma 3.2, the new Riemann surface can be realized by a normal mapping $f_1:\overline{\Delta}\to S$. It is clear that when p_1' is sufficiently close to $\frac{1}{2}$ in case (i), or $\frac{t_0}{2}$ in case (ii), or $\frac{t_0+t_1}{2}$ in case (iii), or $\frac{t_0+1}{2}$ in case (iv), f_1 satisfies (a)–(c) of the lemma and

$$|L(f_1,\partial\Delta)-L(f,\partial\Delta)|<\frac{\varepsilon}{V(f)},A(f_1,\Delta)\geq A(f,\Delta),$$

while the number of natural edges that lie on $[0,+\infty]$ is dropped by one.

Then repeating the above argument for f_1, and so on, and finally we can obtain the desired mapping. □

8. Deformation of edges of normal mappings with length larger than π

In this section we will prove the following theorem, which is prepared for proving Theorem 10.1 and Theorem 11.1.

Theorem 8.1. *Let* $f:\overline{\Delta}\to S$ *be a normal mapping whose boundary curve* $\Gamma_f=f(z),z\in\partial\Delta$, *has the natural partition*

$$\Gamma_f=\Gamma_1+\Gamma_2+\cdots+\Gamma_n,n=V(f),$$

that satisfies one of the following conditions (a)–(d).

(a) $\pi\leq L(\Gamma_1)<2\pi$, $L(\Gamma_j)<\pi$ *for all* $j\geq2$, *and* Γ_1 *has an endpoint contained in* $E=\{0,1,\infty\}$.

(b) $\pi\leq L(\Gamma_1)<2\pi$, $L(\Gamma_j)<\pi$ *for all* $j\geq2$, *and* Γ_1 *has no endpoint contained in* E.

(c) $\pi\leq L(\Gamma_1)<2\pi$ *and* $\pi\leq L(\Gamma_{j_0})<2\pi$ *for some* $j_0\geq2$, $L(\Gamma_j)<\pi$ *for each* $j\neq1,j_0$; Γ_1 *has an endpoint contained in* E, *and so does* Γ_{j_0}.

(d) $2\pi\leq L(\Gamma_1)<3\pi$, *while* $L(\Gamma_j)<\pi$ *for all* $j\geq2$.

Then, there exists a normal mapping $g:\overline{\Delta}\to S$ *such that*

(i) $L(g,\partial\Delta)\leq L(f,\partial\Delta)$ *and* $A(g,\Delta)\geq A(f,\Delta)$

(ii) Each natural edge of g has spherical length strictly less than π,
(iii) In case (a), $V_{NE}(g) \leq V_{NE}(f),\ V_E(g) \geq V_E(f) + 1,$ and $V(g) \leq V(f) + 1;$
In case (b), $V_{NE}(g) \leq V_{NE}(f),\ V_E(g) \geq V_E(f) + 1,$ and $V(g) \leq V(f) + 2;$
In case (c), $V_{NE}(g) \leq V_{NE}(f),\ V_E(g) \geq V_E(f) + 2,$ and $V(g) \leq V(f) + 2;$
In case (d), $V_{NE}(g) = V_{NE}(f) + 2, V_E(g) = V_E(f) + 1,$ and $V(g) = V(f) + 3.$

The proof is divided into four parts: Lemmas 8.3–8.6.

Lemma 8.1. *Let Γ be a line segment in S with endpoints q_1 and q_2 and $\pi \leq L(\Gamma) < 2\pi$, and let q_0 be any point in $S\backslash\Gamma$. Then*

$$d(q_0, q_1) < \pi, d(q_0, q_2) < \pi, \tag{8.1}$$

and

$$L(\overline{q_1q_0}) + L(\overline{q_0q_2}) \leq L(\Gamma).$$

By the first two inequalities, $\overline{q_1q_0}$ and $\overline{q_0q_2}$ make sense, which is the shortest paths.

Proof. Since $L(\Gamma) \geq \pi$, the antipodal points of q_1 and q_2 are both contained in Γ, and thus, neither q_1, nor q_2, can be an antipodal point of $q_0 \in S\backslash\Gamma$. This implies (8.1).

Let q_1' be the antipodal point of q_1 in S. Then $q_1' \in \Gamma$. Let Γ_1' be the section of Γ from q_1 to q_1' and let Γ_1'' be the section of Γ from q_1' to q_2. Then it is clear that $\overline{q_1q_0} + \overline{q_0q_1'}$ is a straight path in S from q_1 to q_1'. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} L(\Gamma) &= L(\Gamma_1') + L(\Gamma_1'') = \pi + L(\Gamma_1'') \\ &= L(\overline{q_1q_0} + \overline{q_0q_1'}) + L(\Gamma_1'') \\ &= L(\overline{q_1q_0}) + L(\overline{q_0q_1'} + \Gamma_1'') \\ &\geq L(\overline{q_1q_0}) + L(\overline{q_0q_2}), \end{aligned}$$

and equality holds if and only if q_1 and q_2 are a pair of antipodal points of S. □

Lemma 8.2. *Let $f : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ be a normal mapping and assume that Γ_f has a natural partition*

$$\Gamma_f = \Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2 + \cdots + \Gamma_n, n = V(f), \tag{8.2}$$

such that $L(\Gamma_1) \geq \pi$ and the initial point of Γ_1 is in E. Then, there exists a normal mapping $f_1 : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ such that

$$L(f_1, \partial\Delta) \leq L(f, \partial\Delta), A(f_1, \Delta) \geq A(f, \Delta),$$

and the boundary curve Γ_{f_1} has a permitted partition

$$\Gamma_{f_1} = \Gamma_1' + \Gamma_1'' + \Gamma_2 + \cdots + \Gamma_n, \tag{8.3}$$

such that the end point of Γ_1', which is also the initial point of Γ_1'', is contained in E, and

$$L(\Gamma_1') < \pi, L(\Gamma_1'') < \pi.$$

See definitions in Section 2 for the terms *natural partition* and *permitted partition.* Since (8.2) is a natural partition and the initial point of Γ_1 is in E, it is clear by (8.3) that the initial point of Γ_1', which is the terminal point of Γ_n, is still the initial point of Γ_1, and then $\Gamma_3, \ldots, \Gamma_n$ are still natural edges of Γ_{f_1}. Then the two endpoints of Γ_1' are both in E, and so Γ_1' is a natual edge. But Γ_2 may not be a natural edge of Γ_{f_1} and Γ_2 is a natural edge if and only if Γ_1' is. In the case Γ_2 is not a natural edge of Γ_{f_1}, $\Gamma_1''+\Gamma_2$ must be a natural edge.

Proof. Let q_1 and q_2 be the initial and terminal point of Γ_1, respectively. Then, Γ_1 contains the antipodal point q_1' of q_1. Let C be the great circle determined[28] by Γ_1 and let S' be the open hemisphere outside[29] C.

There are only two cases (note that we assumed $q_1 \in E$ in the lemma):
Case 1. $q_1 \in E$, $q_1' \notin E$.
Case 2. $q_1 \in E, q_1' \in E$.

Assume the first case occurs. Then we must have $q_1 = 1$ and $q_1' = -1$. Then C must separate 0 and ∞. Without loss of generality, we assume $0 \in S'$. Let $\Gamma_1' = \overline{q_1 0} = \overline{1,0}$, which is the shortest path in S from $q_1 = 1$ to 0 and let $\Gamma_1'' = \overline{0q_2}$. Then the curve $\Gamma_1' + \Gamma_1''$ is a simple path from $q_1 = 1$ to q_2 and $\Gamma_1' + \Gamma_1'' - \Gamma_1$ is a Jordan curve that encloses a domain T in S' such that T is on the right hand side of Γ_1,

$$T \cap E = \emptyset,$$
$$L(\Gamma_1') = \frac{\pi}{2},$$

and by Lemma 8.1,

$$L(\Gamma_1'') < \pi \text{ and } L(\Gamma_1') + L(\Gamma_1'') \le L(\Gamma_1).$$

Let

$$\partial\Delta = \alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_n$$

be a natural partition of $\partial\Delta$ for Γ_f, corresponding[30] to (8.2), let V be a Jordan domain outside Δ with $(\partial V) \cap \partial\Delta = \alpha_1$, and let g be a homeomorphism from $\overline{V}$ onto $\overline{T}$ such that

$$f|_{\alpha_1} = g|_{\alpha_1}.$$

Then, by Lemma 3.2,

$$g_1 = \begin{cases} f(z), z \in \overline{\Delta}, \\ g(z), z \in \overline{V}\backslash\overline{\Delta}, \end{cases}$$

is a normal mapping defined on the closure of the Jordan domain $D = \Delta \cup \alpha_1^\circ \cup V$, where α_1° is the interior of α_1. Then the boundary curve Γ_{g_1} of g_1 has the permitted partition

$$\Gamma_{g_1} = \Gamma_1' + \Gamma_1'' + \Gamma_2 + \cdots + \Gamma_n \tag{8.4}$$

and $A(g_1, D) = A(f, \Delta) + A(T)$. Then we have

$$L(g_1, \partial D) \le L(f, \partial\Delta) \text{ and } A(g_1, D) > A(f, \Delta).$$

Let h be any homeomorphism from $\overline{D}$ onto $\overline{\Delta}$. Then $f_1 = g_1 \circ h^{-1}$ satisfies all the desired conditions in (ii).

Assume Case 2 occur. Then q_1 and q_1' must be the pair $\{0, \infty\}$, $q_1' = q_2$, and there is no point in E located in the interior of Γ_1, for Γ_1 is a natural edge of f. Without loss of generality, we assume that $q_1 = 0$ and $q_2 = q_1' = \infty$. Let L be the straight path from 0 to ∞ that passes through 1. Then, the domain T enclosed by Γ_1 and L that is on the right hand side of Γ_1 does not contains point in E and

---

[28] Recall that this means that C contains Γ_1 and is oriented by C.

[29] Recall that this means S' is on the right hand side of C.

[30] See Definition 2.3 and Remark 2.1 (2).

$\{\Gamma_1 \cup T\} \cap E = \{0, \infty\}$. Let Γ_1' be the section of L from 0 to 1 and Γ_1'' be the section of L from 1 to ∞. Then

$$L(\Gamma') = \frac{\pi}{2}, L(\Gamma_1'') = \frac{\pi}{2},$$

and repeating the process in Case 1, we can obtain a desired f_1 satisfies all the conditions. ☐

Lemma 8.3. *Let* $f : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ *be a normal mapping, and let*

$$\Gamma_f = \Gamma_1 + \cdots + \Gamma_n, n = V(f), \tag{8.5}$$

be the natural partition of $\Gamma_f = f(z), z \in \partial\Delta$. *Assume that*

(a) At least one endpoint of Γ_1 *is contained in* E.

(b) $\pi \leq L(\Gamma_1) < 2\pi$, *but* $L(\Gamma_j) < \pi, j = 2, \dots, n$.

Then, there exists a normal mapping $g : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ *such that*

(i) $L(g, \partial\Delta) \leq L(f, \partial\Delta)$ *and* $A(g, \Delta) \geq A(f, \Delta)$

(ii) Each natural edge of g *has spherical length strictly less than* π,

(iii) $V_{NE}(g) \leq V_{NE}(f)$ *and* $V_E(g) \geq V_E(f) + 1$.

(iv) $V(g) \leq V(f) + 1$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume the initial point q_1 of Γ_1 is in E. Then by Lemma 8.2, there exists a normal mapping $f_1 : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ such that

$$L(f_1, \partial\Delta) \leq L(f, \partial\Delta), A(f_1, \Delta) \geq A(f, \Delta), \tag{8.6}$$

and the boundary curve Γ_{f_1} has a permitted partition

$$\Gamma_{f_1} = \Gamma_1' + \Gamma_1'' + \Gamma_2 + \cdots + \Gamma_n \tag{8.7}$$

such that

$$L(\Gamma_1') = \frac{\pi}{2}, L(\Gamma_1'') < \pi, \tag{8.8}$$

the end point of Γ_1', which is also the initial point of Γ_1'', is contained in E. It is clear that the initial points of Γ_1' and Γ_1 are the same point and so is in E, for they are both the terminal point of Γ_n, by (8.5) and (8.7), and thus, Γ_1' is a natural edge of Γ_{f_1} whose two endpoints are in E, the terminal point of Γ_1'' is a natural vertex of Γ_f, which may not be a natural vertex of Γ_{f_1}. On the other hand, by (8.5) and (8.7), the terminal points of $\Gamma_2, \dots, \Gamma_n$ are still natural vertices of Γ_{f_1}. Then we have

$$V_{NE}(f_1) \leq V_{NE}(f), V_E(f_1) = V_E(f) + 1, V(f_1) \leq V(f) + 1. \tag{8.9}$$

Case 1. If the terminal point of Γ_1 is also in E, then both Γ_1' and Γ_1'' have initial and terminal points in E, and then they are natural edges of f_1 and then (8.7) is a natural partition; therefore, by (8.6)–(8.9) and (b), $g = f_1$ is the desired mapping.

Case 2. Now assume that the terminal point of Γ_1 is not in E.

If Γ_1'' is still a natural edge, then (8.7) is still a natural partition, and $g = f_1$ is the desired mapping by (b) and (8.9).

Assume Γ_1'' is not a natural edge. Then $\Gamma_1'' + \Gamma_2$ will be a natural edge, and then Γ_{f_1} has the natural partition

$$\Gamma_{f_1} = (\Gamma_1'' + \Gamma_2) + \Gamma_3 + \cdots + \Gamma_n + \Gamma_1', \tag{8.10}$$

the initial point of Γ_2, which is also the terminal point of Γ_1'' is now in the interior of the the natural edge $(\Gamma_1'' + \Gamma_2)$ and then we have by (8.10)

$$V_{NE}(f_1) = V_{NE}(f) - 1, V_E(f_1) = V_E(f) + 1, V(f_1) = V(f). \tag{8.11}$$

On the other hand, by (b) and (8.8) we have

$$L(\Gamma_1'' + \Gamma_2) < 2\pi. \tag{8.12}$$

If $L(\Gamma_1'' + \Gamma_2) < \pi$, then $g = f_1$ is the desired mapping.

If $L(\Gamma_1'' + \Gamma_2) \geq \pi$, then f_1 satisfies all the assumption of the lemma with natural partition (8.10), and the above argument applies to f_1. By (8.10)–(8.12), if we repeat the above argument once, and if we do not arrive at the desired mapping, then $V_{NE}(\cdot)$ drops by one, $V_E(\cdot)$ increases by one and $V(\cdot)$ keep invariant. But $V_{NE}(\cdot) \geq 0$ in any case, and so we can reach the desired mapping by repeating the above argument finitely many times. This completes the proof. □

Lemma 8.4. *Let $f : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ be a normal mapping, and let*

$$\Gamma_f = \Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2 + \cdots + \Gamma_n, n = V(f),$$

be a natural partition of $\Gamma_f = f(z), z \in \partial\Delta$. Assume that for some positive integer k_0 with $1 < k_0 \leq n$ the followings hold.

(a) Γ_1 has an endpoint contained in E, and so does Γ_{k_0}.

(b) $\pi \leq L(\Gamma_1) < 2\pi, \pi \leq L(\Gamma_{k_0}) < 2\pi$, but $L(\Gamma_j) < \pi, j \neq 1, k_0$.

Then, there exists a normal mapping $g : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ such that

(i) $L(g, \partial\Delta) \leq L(f, \partial\Delta)$ and $A(g, \Delta) \geq A(f, \Delta)$

(ii) Each natural edge of g has spherical length strictly less than π,

(iii) $V_{NE}(g) \leq V_{NE}(f)$ and $V_E(g) \geq V_E(f) + 2$.

(iv) $V(g) \leq V(f) + 2$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume that the initial point q_1 of Γ_1 is in E.

By Lemma 8.2, there exists a normal mapping $f_1 : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ such that

$$L(f_1, \partial\Delta) \leq L(f, \partial\Delta) \text{ and } A(f_1, \Delta) \geq A(f, \Delta), \tag{8.13}$$

and the boundary curve Γ_{f_1} has a permitted partition

$$\Gamma_{f_1} = \Gamma_1' + \Gamma_1'' + \Gamma_2 + \cdots + \Gamma_n \tag{8.14}$$

such that

$$L(\Gamma_1') = \frac{\pi}{2}, L(\Gamma_1'') < \pi, \tag{8.15}$$

and the end point of Γ_1', which is also the initial point of Γ_1'', is contained in E. Then, Γ_1' is a natural edge of Γ_{f_1}, because its endpoints are both in E.

If Γ_1'' is a natural edge of f_1, then (8.14) is a natural partition and by (a), (b), (8.14) and (8.15), f_1 satisfies all assumptions of Lemma 8.3, with

$$V_{NE}(f_1) = V_{NE}(f), V_E(f_1) = V_E(f) + 1, V(f_1) = V(f) + 1,$$

and then, by (8.13), we can apply Lemma 8.3 to deform f_1 to be another normal mapping g satisfying (i)–(iv) with

$$\begin{cases} V_{NE}(g) \leq V_{NE}(f_1) = V_{NE}(f), \\ V_E(g) \geq V_E(f_1) + 1 = V_E(f) + 2, \\ V(g) \leq V(f_1) + 1 = V(f) + 2. \end{cases}$$

Now, assume that

(c) Γ_1'' is not a natural edge of Γ_{f_1}.

We complete the proof by induction on $k_0 \geq 2$. We first assume $k_0 = 2$.

Then by the assumption (c), $\Gamma_1''+\Gamma_2$ must be a natural edge, Γ_{f_1} has the natural partition

$$\Gamma_{f_1} = \Gamma_1' + (\Gamma_1'' + \Gamma_2) + \Gamma_3 + \cdots + \Gamma_n, \tag{8.16}$$

with

$$V_{NE}(f_1) = V_{NE}(f) - 1, V_E(f_1) = V_E(f) + 1, V(f_1) = V(f), \tag{8.17}$$

and the initial point of Γ_2 is not contained in E, for, otherwise, Γ_1'' has two endpoints in E, which implies that Γ_1'' is a natural edge. Therefore, by (a), the initial and terminal points of the natural edge $\Gamma_1''+\Gamma_2$ of Γ_{f_1} are both contained in E.

By the definition, each natural edge of a closed polygonal curve with initial and terminal points in E is simple and has length $\frac{\pi}{2}$, π, or 2π. Then by (b) and the fact that $L(\Gamma_1''+\Gamma_2) > L(\Gamma_2) \geq \pi$ we have

$$L(\Gamma_1''+\Gamma_2) = 2\pi.$$

Note that we are in the situation that $\Gamma_1''+\Gamma_2$ is a natural edge of Γ_{f_1} and a natural edge never contains any point of E in its interior, and then we conclude that

$$C = \Gamma_1''+\Gamma_2$$

is a great circle passing through 1 with $C\cap E = \{1\}$ (so, 1 is the initial and terminal point of C).

Then C separates 0 and ∞, without loss of generality we assume 0 is on the right hand side of C. Let

$$\partial\Delta = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \cdots + \alpha_n$$

be a natural partition of $\partial\Delta$ corresponding to (8.16) (see Definition 2.3). Then $\Gamma_1''+\Gamma_2$ is the section of Γ_{f_1} restricted to α_2. Let V be a bounded Jordan domain in $\mathbb{C}$ that is outside Δ with $(\partial\Delta)\cap(\partial V) = \alpha_2$, let p_1 and p_2 be the initial and terminal points of α_2, respectively, and let T be the hemisphere on the right hand side of C with the path $\overline{0,1}$ being removed. Then, there exists a continuous mapping τ from $\overline{V}$ onto $\overline{T}$ such that $\tau|_{\alpha_2} = f_1|_{\alpha_2}$, τ restricted to $\alpha_2\cup V$ is a homeomorphism onto $(\Gamma_1''+\Gamma_2)\cup T$ with $\tau(\alpha_2) = \Gamma_1''+\Gamma_2$, and τ restricted to $(\partial V)\setminus\alpha_2 = (\partial V)\setminus\overline{\Delta}$ is a folded 2 to 1 mapping onto $\overline{0,1}$. Then by Lemma 3.2, the mapping

$$f^* = \begin{cases} f_1(z), z\in\overline{\Delta}, \\ \tau(z), z\in\overline{V}\setminus\overline{\Delta}, \end{cases}$$

is a normal mapping defined on the closure of the Jordan domain

$$\Delta^* = \Delta\cup V\cup\alpha_2\setminus\{p_1,p_2\},$$

with

$$A(f^*,\Delta^*) = A(f_1,\Delta) + A(T),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} L(f^*,\partial\Delta^*) &= L(f_1,((\partial\Delta)\setminus\alpha_2)) + L(f,(\partial V)\setminus\alpha_2) \\ &= L(f_1,\partial\Delta) - L(f_1,\alpha_2) + L(f,(\partial V)\setminus\alpha_2) \\ &= L(f_1,\partial\Delta) - L(\Gamma_1''+\Gamma_2) + L(\overline{1,0}) + L(\overline{0,1}) \\ &= L(f_1,\partial\Delta) - 2\pi + \frac{\pi}{2} + \frac{\pi}{2} \\ &< L(f_1,\partial\Delta), \end{aligned}$$

and the boundary curve Γ_{f^*} has a natural partition

$$\Gamma_{f^*} = \Gamma_1' + \Gamma_2' + \Gamma_2'' + \Gamma_3 + \cdots + \Gamma_n,$$

and we have $V_E(f^*) = V_E(f_1) + 1$ and $V(f^*) = V(f_1) + 1$, and then by (8.17) we have

$$V_E(f^*) \geq V_E(f) + 2, V(f^*) \leq V(f) + 2.$$

Considering that $V(f^*) = V_E(f^*) + V_{NE}(f^*)$ and regarding Δ^* as a disk, we obtained the desired mapping $g = f^*$ that satisfies (i)–(iv). The proof is complete for the case $k_0 = 2$ under the assumption (c).

Then we have in fact prove the lemma in the case $k_0 = 2$.

Now, assume that for some positive integer m with $2 \leq m < n = V(f)$, Lemma 8.4 holds true for all k_0 with $2 \leq k_0 \leq m$. We prove that Lemma 8.4 holds true for $k_0 = m + 1$.

To prove the lemma for $k_0 = m + 1$, it is suffices to prove the lemma under the assumption (c).

By the assumption (c), $\Gamma_1'' + \Gamma_2$ is still a natural edge of Γ_{f_1} and since $k_0 = m + 1 \geq 3$ we have, by (b) and (8.15), that

$$L(\Gamma_1'' + \Gamma_2) < 2\pi,$$

the initial point of $\Gamma_1'' + \Gamma_2$ is in E, and (8.17) still holds.

If $L(\Gamma_1'' + \Gamma_2) < \pi$, then f_1 also satisfies all assumptions of Lemma 8.3 and by (8.17) we can again deform f_1 to be another normal mapping g such that (i)–(iv) hold.

If

$$\pi \leq L(\Gamma_1'' + \Gamma_2) < 2\pi,$$

then, considering that by (8.14) Γ_{f_1} also has the following natural partition

$$\Gamma_{f_1} = (\Gamma_1'' + \Gamma_2) + \Gamma_3 + \cdots + \Gamma_n + \Gamma_1',$$

f_1 satisfies all the assumption of Lemma 8.4, with $k_0 = m$. Then by the induction hypothesis, the proof is complete. □

Lemma 8.5. *Let* $f : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ *be a normal mapping and let*

$$\Gamma_f = \Gamma_1 + \cdots + \Gamma_n, n = V(f),$$

be a natural partition of $\Gamma_f = f(z), z \in \partial\Delta$. *Assume that the following hold.*

(a) $\pi \leq L(\Gamma_1) < 2\pi$ *but* $L(\Gamma_j) < \pi$ *for all* $j = 2, \ldots, n$.

(b) The two endpoints of Γ_1 *are outside* E.

Then, there exists a normal mapping $g : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ *such that*

(i) $L(g, \partial\Delta) \leq L(f, \partial\Delta)$ *and* $A(g, \Delta) \geq A(f, \Delta)$

(ii) Each natural edge of g *has spherical length strictly less than* π,

(iii) $V_{NE}(g) \leq V_{NE}(f)$ and $V_E(g) \geq V_E(f) + 1$.

(iv) $V(g) \leq V(f) + 2$.

Proof. Let C be the great circle determined by Γ_1. Then there are two cases:

Case 1. $C \cap E \neq \emptyset$.

Case 2. $C \cap E = \emptyset$.

Assume Case 1 occurs. Then by (a), C contains only one point p_0 in E and this point must be 1. Otherwise, C contains the antipodal points 0 and ∞, and either 0 or ∞ is in the interior of Γ_1 by (a) and (b), which contradicts the assumption that Γ_1 is a natural edge. Then C must separates 0 and ∞, without loss of generality, assume 0 is on the right hand side of C. Let q_j be the initial point of $\Gamma_j, j = 1, \dots, n$. Then q_{j+1} is the endpoint of $\Gamma_j, j = 1, \dots, n$, where $q_{n+1} = q_1$. Let

$$\Gamma_1' = \overline{q_1 0} \text{ and } \Gamma_1'' = \overline{0 q_2}. \tag{8.18}$$

Then, by Lemma 8.1, Γ_1' and Γ_1'' make sense and

$$L(\Gamma_1') < \pi, L(\Gamma_1'') < \pi \text{ and } L(\Gamma_1') + L(\Gamma_1'') \leq L(\Gamma_1), \tag{8.19}$$

and $\Gamma_1' + \Gamma_1'' - \Gamma_1$ encloses a domain T that is on the right hand side of C and $(\Gamma_1 \cup T) \cap E = \emptyset$.

By Lemma 3.2, ignoring a coordinate transform, there exists a normal mapping $g_1 : \overline{\Delta} \to S$, which will be regarded as an extension of f, such that Γ_{g_1} has the permitted partition

$$\Gamma_{g_1} = \Gamma_1' + \Gamma_1'' + \Gamma_2 + \cdots + \Gamma_n$$

and

$$L(g_1, \partial\Delta) \leq L(f, \partial\Delta), A(g_1, \Delta) \geq A(f, \Delta). \tag{8.20}$$

It is clear that we have

$$V_{NE}(g_1) \leq V_{NE}(f), V_E(g_1) = V_E(f) + 1, V(g_1) \leq V(f) + 1, \tag{8.21}$$

and we can rewrite the permitted partition of Γ_{g_1} as

$$\Gamma_{g_1} = \Gamma_n + \Gamma_1' + \Gamma_1'' + \Gamma_2 + \cdots + \Gamma_{n-1}.$$

Then there are three cases:

Case 1.1. Both Γ_1' and Γ_1'' are natural edges of Γ_{g_1}.

Case 1.2. One of Γ_1' and Γ_1'' is a natural edge, while the other is not.

Case 1.3. Neither Γ_1' nor Γ_1'' is a natural edge.

In Case 1.1, it is clear that $g = g_1$ satisfies all the desired conclusions with

$$V_{NE}(g_1) = V_{NE}(f),\ V_E(g_1) = V_E(f) + 1, V(g_1) = V(f) + 1. \tag{8.22}$$

Assume Case 1.2 occurs. Without loss of generality, assume that Γ_1'' is a natural edge. Then Γ_{g_1} has the natural partition

$$\Gamma_{g_1} = (\Gamma_n + \Gamma_1') + \Gamma_1'' + \Gamma_2 + \cdots + \Gamma_{n-1}$$

where $(\Gamma_n + \Gamma_1')$ is a natural edge, and (8.21) becomes

$$V_{NE}(g_1) = V_{NE}(f) - 1,\ V_E(g_1) = V_E(f) + 1 \text{ and } V(g_1) = V(f). \tag{8.23}$$

Then, in the case $L(\Gamma_n + \Gamma_1') < \pi$, by (a) and (8.19), $g = g_1$ satisfies (i)–(iv) with (8.23); and in the case $L(\Gamma_n + \Gamma_1') \geq \pi$, by (a), (8.18) and (8.19), $\pi \leq L(\Gamma_n + \Gamma_1') < 2\pi$ and g_1 satisfies the assumption of Lemma 8.3 with (8.23), and then, by (8.20), there exists a normal mapping $g : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ that satisfies (i) and (ii), and

$$V_{NE}(g) \leq V_{NE}(g_1),\ V_E(g) \geq V_E(g_1) + 1 \text{ and } V(g) \leq V(g_1) + 1,$$

and so by (8.23), (iii) and (iv) are satisfied by g with

$$V_{NE}(g) \leq V_{NE}(f) - 1,\ V_E(g) \geq V_E(f) + 2 \text{ and } V(g) \leq V(f) + 1. \tag{8.24}$$

Assume Case 1.3 occurs. Then both $\Gamma_n + \Gamma_1'$ and $\Gamma_1'' + \Gamma_2$ are natural edges of g_1, Γ_{g_1} has the natural partition

$$\Gamma_{g_1} = (\Gamma_n + \Gamma_1') + (\Gamma_1'' + \Gamma_2) + \Gamma_3 + \cdots + \Gamma_{n-1}$$

and (8.21) becomes

$$V_{NE}(g_1) = V_{NE}(f) - 2, V_E(g_1) = V_E(f) + 1, V(g_1) = V(f) - 1. \tag{8.25}$$

By (a) and (8.19) we have

$$L(\Gamma_n+\Gamma_1')<2\pi \text{ and } L(\Gamma_1''+\Gamma_2)<2\pi. \tag{8.26}$$

Then, by (a), in the case

$$L(\Gamma_n+\Gamma_1')<\pi \text{ and } L(\Gamma_1''+\Gamma_2)<\pi, \tag{8.27}$$

$g=g_1$ is the desired mapping satisfying (i)–(iv) with (8.25); and in the case that (8.27) fails, by (a), (8.18) and (8.26), Lemma 8.3 or Lemma 8.4 applies, and then there exists a normal mapping g satisfies (i), (ii) and

$$V_{NE}(g)\leq V_{NE}(g_1), V_E(g)\geq V_E(g_1)+1, V(g)\leq V(g_1)+2,$$

which, with (8.25), implies

$$V_{NE}(g)\leq V_{NE}(f), V_E(g)\geq V_E(f)+1, V(g)\leq V(f)+1,$$

i.e. (iii) and (iv) hold. This completes the proof in Case 1.3.

Now, assume Case 2 occurs. Then the hemisphere S' outside C contains one or two points of E. If S' contains only one point of E, the proof is exactly the same as the above arguments. So, we assume that S' contains two points q_0 and q_0' of E. Then either $\{q_0,q_0'\}=\{0,1\}$ or $\{1,\infty\}$, and then there are two cases:

Case 2.1. The great circle of S containing q_0 and q_0' intersects $C\backslash\Gamma_1$.

Case 2.2. The great circle containing q_0 and q_0' does not intersects $C\backslash\Gamma_1$.

In Case 2.1, the argument for Case 1 exactly applies.

In Case 2.2, it is easy to show that the exists two points r_1 and r_1' on Γ_1 such that r_1 close to q_1 and r_1' close to q_2 (in Γ_1), and r_1,q_0,q_0',r_1' or r_1,q_0',q_0,r_1' are in order on the geodesic path from r_1 to r_1' in S', (then r_1 and r_1' are antipodal). We assume r_1,q_0,q_0',r_1' is ordered in the orientation of the geodesic path from r_1 to r_1' in S'. It is clear that the notations

$$\Gamma_1'=\overline{q_1q_0},\gamma=\overline{q_0q_0'},\Gamma_1''=\overline{q_0'q_2}.$$

make sense. Then

$$L(\Gamma_1')<\pi, L(\Gamma_1'')<\pi, L(\gamma)=\frac{\pi}{2}, \tag{8.28}$$

and it is also clear that

$$L(\Gamma_1')+L(\gamma)+L(\Gamma_1'')=L(\Gamma_1')+\frac{\pi}{2}+L(\Gamma_1'')<L(\Gamma_1)<2\pi, \tag{8.29}$$

and $\Gamma_1'+\gamma+\Gamma_1''-\Gamma_1$ encloses a Jordan domain T in S' with $(\Gamma_1\cup T)\cap E=\emptyset$.

By Lemma 3.2, there exists a normal mapping g_1, such that Γ_{g_1} has the permitted partition

$$\Gamma_{g_1}=\Gamma_1'+\gamma+\Gamma_1''+\Gamma_2+\cdots+\Gamma_n$$

and by (8.29),

$$L(g_1,\partial\Delta)\leq L(f,\partial\Delta), A(f,\Delta)\geq A(g_1,\Delta).$$

It is clear that we have

$$V_{NE}(g_1)\leq V_{NE}(f), V_E(g_1)=V_E(f)+2 \text{ and } V(g_1)\leq V(f)+2 \tag{8.30}$$

and we rewrite the permitted partition of Γ_{g_1} as

$$\Gamma_{g_1}=\Gamma_n+\Gamma_1'+\gamma+\Gamma_1''+\Gamma_2+\cdots+\Gamma_{n-1}. \tag{8.31}$$

Note that γ is always a natural edge of Γ_{g_1}, because the endpoints of γ are both in E.

Then there are three cases:

Case 2.2.1. Both Γ_1' and Γ_1'' are natural edges of Γ_{g_1}.
Case 2.2.2. One of Γ_1' and Γ_1'' is a natural edge, while the other is not.
Case 2.2.3. Neither Γ_1' nor Γ_1'' is a natural edge.

In Case 2.2.1, (8.31) is a natural partition, and by (8.28), $g = g_1$ satisfies (i)–(iv) with (8.30).

In Case 2.2.2, we may assume Γ_1' is a natural edge, and then by (8.31), Γ_{g_1} has the natural partition

$$\Gamma_{g_1} = \Gamma_n + \Gamma_1' + \gamma + (\Gamma_1'' + \Gamma_2) + \Gamma_3 \cdots + \Gamma_{n-1}.$$

Then, by (8.30) and (8.31),

$$V_{NE}(g_1) \leq V_{NE}(f), V_E(g_1) = V_E(f) + 2 \text{ and } V(g_1) = V(f) + 1. \tag{8.32}$$

Then, by (a) and (8.28), in the case $L(\Gamma_1'' + \Gamma_2) < \pi$, $g = g_1$ satisfies (i)–(iv) with (8.30), and otherwise, Lemma 8.3 applies to g_1, and then there exists a normal mapping $g : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ satisfying (i)–(iv), by (8.32), with

$$\begin{cases} V_{NE}(g) \leq V_{NE}(g_1) \leq V_{NE}(f), \\ V_E(g) \geq V_E(g_1) + 1 = V_E(f) + 3, \\ V(g) \leq V(g_1) + 1 = V(f) + 2. \end{cases} \tag{8.33}$$

In Case 2.2.3, $\Gamma_n + \Gamma_1'$ and $\Gamma_1'' + \Gamma_2$ are two natural edges of Γ_{g_1} with

$$L(\Gamma_n + \Gamma_1') < 2\pi \text{ and } L(\Gamma_1'' + \Gamma_2) < 2\pi;$$

Γ_{g_1} has the natural partition

$$\Gamma_{g_1} = (\Gamma_n + \Gamma_1') + \gamma + (\Gamma_1'' + \Gamma_2) + \Gamma_3 + \cdots + \Gamma_{n-1}.$$

and (8.30) becomes

$$V_{NE}(g_1) \leq V_{NE}(f), V_E(g_1) = V_E(f) + 2 \text{ and } V(g_1) = V(f). \tag{8.34}$$

Then, by (a) and (8.28), in the case $L(\Gamma_n + \Gamma_1') < \pi$ and $L(\Gamma_1'' + \Gamma_2) < \pi$, $g = g_1$ satisfies (i)–(iv) with (8.34), and in other cases, Lemma 8.3 or Lemma 8.4 applies to g_1, and then there exists a normal mapping $g : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ satisfying (i)–(iv) with

$$\begin{cases} V_{NE}(g) \leq V_{NE}(g_1) \leq V_{NE}(f), \\ V_E(g) \geq V_E(g_1) + 1 = V_E(f) + 3, \\ V(g) \leq V(g_1) + 2 = V(f) + 2. \end{cases} \tag{8.35}$$

This completes the proof. □

Lemma 8.6. *Let $f : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ be a normal mapping, and let*

$$\Gamma_f = \Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2 + \cdots + \Gamma_n, n = V(f), \tag{8.36}$$

be a natural partition of $\Gamma_f = f(z), z \in \partial\Delta$. Assume that

$$2\pi \leq L(\Gamma_1) < 3\pi, \tag{8.37}$$

and

$$L(\Gamma_j) < \pi \text{ for } j = 2, \ldots, n. \tag{8.38}$$

Then, there exists a normal mapping $g : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ such that
(i) $L(g, \partial\Delta) \leq L(f, \partial\Delta)$ and $A(g, \Delta) \geq A(f, \Delta)$
(ii) Each natural edge of g has spherical length strictly less than π,
(iii) $V_{NE}(g) = V_{NE}(f) + 2$, $V_E(g) = V_E(f) + 1$ and $V(g) = V(f) + 3$.

Proof. Let C be the great circle determined by Γ_1. Then by (8.37) we have $C \subset \Gamma_1$, and by the definition of natural edges, in the case that $L(\Gamma_1) = 2\pi$, the only possible point of $E = \{0, 1, \infty\}$ contained in C is 1, and in the case that $2\pi < L(\Gamma_1) < 3\pi$, C does not intsects E, for otherwise the interior α_1° of α_1 contains at least one point of $f^{-1}(E)$.

Let S' be the hemisphere outside[31] C. Then

$$1 \leq \#(S' \cap E) \leq 2. \tag{8.39}$$

Let

$$\partial\Delta = \alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_n$$

be a natural partition of $\partial\Delta$ corresponding the partition (8.36) and let p_1 and p_4 be the initial and terminal point of α_1, respectively. Then by (8.37) and (8.39), summarizing what we have, there exists p_2 and p_3 in the interior of α_1 such that p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4 are in order anticlockwise and the followings hold.

(a) f restricted to each section α_j' of α_1 from p_j and p_{j+1} is a homeomorphism, $j = 1, 2, 3$.

(b) For the sections $\Gamma_j' = f(z), z \in \alpha_j, j = 1, 2, 3$

$$L(\Gamma_2') = \pi,\ L(\Gamma_1') < \pi,\ L(\Gamma_3') < \pi.$$

(c) Any shortest path from q_2 to q_3 contains at most one point of E.

Then by the definition of natural edges,

$$\Gamma_2' \cap E = \emptyset,$$

and by (b), q_2 and q_3 are antipodal. Therefore, by (8.39) and (c), there exists a unique shortest path L from q_2 to q_3 such that $L - \Gamma_2'$ enclose a domain T such that $\overline{T} \cap E$ contains exactly one point $q \in E$, which lies in $L \cap S'$. We denote by Γ' the section of L from $q_2 = f(p_2)$ to $q = f(q)$ and by Γ'' the section of L from q to $q_3 = f(p_3)$.

Then we can extend the Riemann surface of f to be a new Riemann surface so that in the new Riemann surface, $\overline{T}$ is patched along Γ_2'. By Lemma 3.2, this can be realized by a normal mapping $g : \overline{\Delta} \to S$. Then the boundary curve $\Gamma_g = g(z), \in \partial\Delta$, has the following natural partition

$$\Gamma_g = \Gamma_1' + \Gamma' + \Gamma'' + \Gamma_3' + \Gamma_2 + \cdots + \Gamma_n, \tag{8.40}$$

because Γ_1', Γ_3' is in Γ_1 and Γ' and Γ'' are clearly natural edges.

It is clear that Γ_g satisfies (ii) and

$$L(\Gamma_1') + L(\Gamma') + L(\Gamma'') + L(\Gamma_3') = L(\Gamma_1') + L(\Gamma_2') + L(\Gamma_3') = L(f, \alpha_1), \tag{8.41}$$

and then by (8.40) we have

$$L(g, \partial\Delta) = L(f, \partial\Delta).$$

On the other hand, it is also clear that

$$A(g, \Delta) = A(f, \Delta) + A(T) > A(f, \Delta).$$

Thus, g satisfies (i).

On the other hand, by (8.40), considering that all the natural vertices of Γ_f are natural vertices of Γ_g and q_2', q_3' and q' are the three new natural vertices of g, we have

$$V_{NE}(g) = V_{NE}(f) + 2, V_E(g) = V_E(f) + 1, V(g) = V(f) + 3.$$

---

[31] This means that S' is on the right hand side of C. Note that C is oriented by Γ_1.

Thus, (iii) is satisfied by g. This completes the proof. $\square$

9. Movement of branched points

This section is prepared for prove Theorem 10.1.

Lemma 9.1. *Let* $f : \overline{\Delta^+} \to \overline{\Delta}$ *be an orientation preserved open mapping that satisfies the following conditions:*

(a) f *restricted to the upper half circle* $(\partial\Delta)^+ = \{z \in \partial\Delta; \mathrm{Im} z \geq 0\}$ *is given by* $f(e^{i\theta}) = e^{\phi(\theta)i}$, *where* ϕ *is a strictly increasing function defined on* $[0, \pi]$ *with* $\phi(0) = 0$ *and* $\phi(\pi) = (2d + 1)\pi$, *where* d *is a positive integer.*

(b) f *maps the interval* $[-1, -1]$ *homeomorphically onto the interval* $[-1, 1]$.

(c) $p_0 \in \Delta^+$ *is the unique ramification point of* f *in* $\overline{\Delta^+}$.

Then there exists an orientation preserved open mapping $g : \overline{\Delta^+} \to \overline{\Delta}$ *such that the followings hold.*

(I) $z = 0$ *is the unique ramification point of* g *in* $\overline{\Delta^+}$ *and* $g(0) = 0$.

(II) $g|_{(\partial\Delta)^+} = f|_{(\partial\Delta)^+}$ *and* g *restricted to the interval* $[-1, 1]$ *is a homeomorphism onto the interval* $[-1, 1]$.

Remark 9.1. *g acts as an orientation preserved open mapping that moves the unique ramification point p_0 of f into the boundary of Δ^+ with the same branched number, while none other ramification points appear.*

Proof. There exists an orientation preserved homeomorphism f_1 from $\overline{\Delta^-}$ onto $\overline{\Delta^-}$ such that

$$f_1|_{[-1,1]} = f|_{[-1,1]}.$$

Then

$$f_2(z) = \begin{cases} f(z), z \in \overline{\Delta^+}, \\ f_1(z), z \in \overline{\Delta^-} \backslash \overline{\Delta^+}, \end{cases}$$

is an orientation preserved $d + 1$ to 1 covering mapping from $\overline{\Delta}$ onto $\overline{\Delta}$ such that p_0 is the unique ramification point of f_2, and then there exists another covering mapping $f_3 : \overline{\Delta} \to \overline{\Delta}$ such that

$$f_3|_{\partial\Delta} = f_2|_{\partial\Delta}$$

and that 0 is the unique ramification point of f_3 with $f_3(0) = 0$.

It is clear that the path $\beta = \beta(t), t \in [-1, 1]$ in $\overline{\Delta}$ has a unique lift $\alpha = \alpha(t), t \in [-1, 1]$, in $\overline{\Delta}$ such that

$$\alpha(-1) = -1, \alpha(1) = 1,$$

f_3 restricted to α is a homeomorphism with

$$f_3(\alpha(t)) = \beta(t) = t, t \in [-1, 1],$$

and α is a Jordan path and the interior of α is contained in Δ. Thus α divides Δ into two Jordan domains and one of these domains is enclosed by $(\partial\Delta)^+$ and α, and we denote this domain by U^+. Then f_3 restricted to $\overline{\Delta^+ \backslash U^+}$ is a homeomorphism.

Now consider the restriction $f_3|_{\overline{U^+}}$. Let h be a homeomorphism from $\overline{\Delta^+}$ onto $\overline{U^+}$ such that h restricted to $(\partial\Delta)^+$ is an identity mapping, restricted to the interval $[-1, 1]$ is a homeomorphism onto α with $h(0) = 0$ (note that $0 \in \alpha$), and finally let

$$g = f_3 \circ h(z), z \in \overline{\Delta^+}.$$

Then g satisfies all the desired conditions. $\square$

Remark 9.2. *By the proof we may construct that* g *such that* $g(0) = t$ *for any fixed* $t \in (-1, 1)$*,* 0 *is the unique ramification point of* g *and all other conclusions hold.*

Lemma 9.2. *Let* $f : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ *be a normal mapping, let* $p_0 \in \Delta$ *be a ramification point of* f *with* $v_f(p_0) = d + 1$*, and assume that* $\beta = \beta(t), t \in [0, 1]$*, is a polygonal Jordan path in* S *that satisfies the followings:*

(a) $\beta(0) = f(p_0)$*,* $\beta(0) \neq \beta(1)$ *and* β *has a number of* $d + 1$ *lifts* $\alpha_j = \alpha_j(t), t \in [0, 1]$*, by* f *in* $\overline{\Delta}$*, such that*

$$\cup_{j=2}^{d+1} \alpha_j \subset \Delta,$$

$$f(\alpha_j(t)) = \beta(t), t \in [0, 1], j = 1, \ldots, d + 1,$$

and

$$\alpha_j(0) = p_0, \ j = 1, \ldots, d + 1,$$

(b) $\alpha_1(t) \in \Delta$ *for all* $t \in [0, 1)$ *but* $p_1 = \alpha_1(1) \in \partial\Delta$*.*

(c) f *has no ramification point on* $\cup_{j=1}^{d+1} \alpha_j(0, 1]$*, where* $\alpha_j(0, 1]$ *is the curve* $\alpha_j(t), t \in (0, 1]$*, which is the curve* α_j *without initial point,* $j = 1, 2, \ldots d + 1$*.*

(d) f *restricted to a neighborhood of* $p_1 = \alpha_1(1)$ *in* $\overline{\Delta}$ *is a homeomorphism.*

Then, there exist a normal mapping $g : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ *such that*

$$A(g, \Delta) = A(f, \Delta), L(g, \partial\Delta) = L(f, \partial\Delta),$$

and the followings hold.

(I) The ramification point p_0 *of* f *is no longer a ramification point of* g*, while the regular point* p_1 *of* f *is a regular point of* g *with*

$$g(p_1) = \beta(1) = f(p_1) \text{ and } v_f(p_0) = v_g(p_1).$$

(II) The boundary curves $\Gamma_f = f(e^{i\theta}), \theta \in [0, 2\pi]$*, and* $\Gamma_g = g(e^{i\theta}), \theta \in [0, 2\pi]$*, are the same curves after a parameter transformation.*

(III) The ramification point sets of f *and* g *in* $\overline{\Delta} \backslash \{p_0, p_1\}$ *are the same, and* f *and* g *coincide in a neighborhood of this ramification point set.*

.

Remark 9.3. g *acts as a normal mapping that moves the ramification point* p_0 *of* f *into the boundary* $\partial\Delta$ *with the same branched number, while all other ramification points, as well as their branched number, remain unchanged, and no other new ramification point appear, and the length and the area also remains unchanged.*

Proof. Let $\delta < \frac{1}{2}$ be a positive number, let D_δ be the disk $|z - p_1| < \delta$ in $\mathbb{C}$, let $c = (\partial\Delta) \cap \overline{D_\delta}$, which will be regarded as a path from $p_2 \in \partial\Delta$ to $p_3 \in \partial\Delta$ (anticlockwise). Then p_1 is the middle point of c. We write

$$q_j = f(p_j), j = 1, 2, 3;$$

$$D_\delta^+ = D_\delta \backslash \overline{\Delta},$$

$$\Delta^* = \Delta \cup D_\delta \cup c \backslash \{p_2, p_3\};$$

$$\gamma = f(c);$$

$$e = \partial\Delta^* \cap \overline{D_\delta} = (\partial D_\delta) \backslash \Delta,$$

which is the boundary of Δ^* outside Δ, and is the boundary of ∂D_δ outside Δ as well. It is clear that Δ^* is a Jordan domain (note that $\delta < \frac{1}{2}$) and

$$\partial\Delta^* = e \cup ((\partial\Delta) \backslash c), \ e \cap \overline{(\partial\Delta) \backslash c} = \{p_2, p_3\}.$$

Since f is normal and $\alpha_2 \subset \Delta$ (by (a)), we have that

$$f(p_1) = f(\alpha_1(1)) = f(\alpha_2(1)) \notin E.$$

On the other hand, by (c) and (d), we may take the number δ sufficiently small such that the following conditions (e)–(f) are satisfied.

(e) f restricted to c is a homeomorphism onto $\gamma = f(c) = \overline{q_2q_1q_3}$, i.e., γ is a polygonal Jordan path with only one possible vertex at q_1.

(f) There exists a point q_1' in $S\backslash\gamma$ such that q_1' is very close to γ and is on the right hand side of γ, and the quadrangle $\overline{q_2q_1'q_3q_1q_2}$ encloses a domain T that is on the right hand side of γ, with $\overline{T} \cap E = \emptyset$, and $f^{-1}(\overline{T})$ has d components A_j with $f(\alpha_j(1) \in A_j$ and f restricted to each A_j is a homeomorphism onto $\overline{T}$, for $j = 2, \ldots, d+1$.

(g) β intersects $\overline{T}$ only at $q_1 = f(p_1)$.

Let f_1 be an orientation preserved homeomorphism from $\overline{D_\delta^+}$ onto $\overline{T}$ such that f_1 and f restricted to c are equal to each other. Then

$$f_2(z) = \begin{cases} f(z), z \in \overline{\Delta}, \\ f_1(z), z \in \overline{D_\delta^+}\backslash\overline{\Delta}, \end{cases}$$

is a normal mapping defined on $\overline{\Delta^*}$.

The above argument show that T can be extended to be a polygonal Jordan domain T^* such that the followings hold.

(h) $\beta \subset T^*$, the path $\gamma' = \overline{q_2q_1'q_3}$ is still a section of ∂T^*, and

$$(\gamma \cup T)\backslash\{q_2, q_3\} \subset T^*.$$

(i) f_2 restricted to the component $\overline{U}$ of $f_2^{-1}(\overline{T^*})$ with $p_0 \in U$ is a $d+1$ to 1 covering with the unique ramification point p_0, and $f_2(\overline{U}) = \overline{T^*}$.

(j) The boundary of U is composed of e and a Jordan path α in $\overline{\Delta}$ whose interior is in U and endpoints are p_2 and p_3.

Then $V = U \cap \Delta$ is also a Jordan domain. Let h_1 be a homeomorphism from $\overline{V}$ onto $\overline{\Delta^+}$ such that h_1 maps α homeomorphically onto $(\partial\Delta)^+$, maps c homeomorphically onto the interval $[-1, 1]$ with

$$h_1(p_1) = 0;$$

let h_2 be a homeomorphism from $\overline{T^*}$ onto $\overline{\Delta}$ such that h_2 maps $(\partial T^*)\backslash\{\gamma'\backslash\{q_2, q_3\}\}$ homeomorphically onto $(\partial\Delta)^+$, maps γ' homeomorphically onto $(\partial\Delta)^-$, and maps γ homeomorphically onto the interval $[-1, 1]$ with

$$h_2(q_1) = 0;$$

and finally let

$$g_1 = h_2 \circ f_2|_{\overline{V}} \circ h_1^{-1}(\zeta) : \overline{\Delta^+} \to \overline{\Delta}.$$

Then g_1 is an orientation preserved open mapping that satisfies all the assumptions of Lemma 9.1, and then there exists an orientation preserved open mapping $g_2 : \overline{\Delta^+} \to \overline{\Delta}$ such that the followings hold.

(k) 0 is the unique ramification point of g_2 in $\overline{\Delta^+}$ and $g_2(0) = 0$.

(l) $g_2|_{(\partial\Delta)^+} = f|_{(\partial\Delta)^+}$ and both f and g_2 restricted to the interval $[-1, 1]$ are homeomorphisms onto the interval $[-1, 1]$.

Let

$$g_3 = h_2^{-1} \circ g_2 \circ h_1(z), z \in \overline{V}.$$

Then g_3 restricted to a neighborhood of α in $\overline{V}$ is a homeomorphism, g_3 maps c homeomorphically onto γ and g_3 restricted to α equals the restriction of f to α and

$$A(g_3, V) = (d+1)\, A(T^*) - A(T) = A(f, U) - A(f, D_\delta^+) = A(f, V).$$

Now,

$$g(z) = \begin{cases} f(z), z \in \overline{\Delta}\backslash\overline{V}, \\ g_3(z), z \in \overline{V}, \end{cases}$$

is the desired mapping. □

Lemma 9.3. *Let*

$$\alpha_1 = \alpha_1(\theta) = e^{i\theta}, \theta \in [\theta_1, \theta_2]$$

with $\theta_1 < \theta_2 < \theta_1 + 2\pi$, *be a section of* $\partial\Delta$ *and let*

$$p_j = \alpha_1(e^{i\theta_j}), j = 1, 2;$$

let $f : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ *be a normal mapping such that* p_1 *is a ramification point of* f *with*

$$v_f(p_1) = d.$$

Assume that the section

$$\beta = \beta(\theta) = f(e^{i\theta}), \theta \in [\theta_1, \theta_2],$$

of $\Gamma_f = f(z), z \in \partial\Delta$, *is a Jordan path with*

$$\beta \cap E = \emptyset,$$

and β *has* $d = v_f(p_1)$ *distinct lifts*

$$\alpha_j = \alpha_j(\theta), \theta \in [\theta_1, \theta_2], j = 1, \ldots, d$$

in $\overline{\Delta}$ *by* f, *such that*

(a) For each $j = 1, \ldots, d$, $f(\alpha_j(\theta)) = f(\alpha_1(\theta)) = \beta(\theta)$ *for* $\theta \in [\theta_1, \theta_2]$ *and* $\alpha_j(\theta_1) = p_1$.

(b) For each $j = 2, \ldots, d$, $\alpha_j(\theta) \in \Delta$ *for* $\theta \in (\theta_1, \theta_2]$.

(c) There is no ramification point of f *in* $\cup_{j=1}^d \alpha_j$ *other than* p_1.

(d) f *restricted to a neighborhood of* p_j *in* $\partial\Delta$ *is a homeomorphism, for* $j = 1, 2$.

Then, there exists a normal mapping $g : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ *such that*

$$A(g, \Delta) = A(f, \Delta), L(g, \partial\Delta) = L(f, \partial\Delta),$$

and the followings hold.

(I) The ramification point $p_1 = e^{i\theta_1}$ *of* f *is no longer a ramification point of* g, *while the regular point* $p_2 = e^{i\theta_2}$ *of* f *is a ramification point of* g *with* $g(p_2) = \beta(\theta_2) = f(p_2)$ *and*

$$b_f(p_1) = b_g(p_2).$$

(II) The boundary curves $f(e^{i\theta})$ *and* $g(e^{i\theta})$ *are the same after a parameter transform.*

(III) In $\overline{\Delta}\backslash\{p_1, p_2\}$, f *and* g *has the same set of ramification points and* f *and* g *coincide in a neighborhood of this ramification point set.*

Proof. There are two ways to prove this lemma. One way is to use Remark 9.2. Here we use Lemma 9.2 to give another proof.

We will first construct a normal mapping f_2 that is defined on some closed Jordan domain $\overline{\Delta'} \ni p_2$ such that the length and the area concerned in the lemma unchanged, the boundary curve Γ_{f_2} of f_2 is the same as that of f, f and f_2 have the same set B of ramification points in $\overline{\Delta}\backslash\{p_1, p_2\}$, f_2 and f coincide in a neighborhood of this ramification point set, and f_2 has only one more ramification point p_1' outside B, while p_1' is in the interior of the domain Δ', and there is a path β_3 whose interior and initial point are located in Δ' and the terminal point is $p_2 \in \partial\Delta'$, and f_2 and β_3 satisfies all assumptions of Lemma 9.2 if Δ' is regarded as a disk. Then by applying Lemma 9.2, we obtain the desired conclusion.

Let $\delta < \frac{1}{2}$ be a positive number, D_δ the disk $|z - p_1| < \delta$, c the section of $\partial\Delta$ that is contained in $\overline{D_\delta}$ and regarded as a path from s_1 to s_2 anticlockwise, e the section of ∂D_δ that is outside Δ V the part of D_δ outside Δ and write .

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma &= f(c), \\ t_1 &= f(s_1), t_2 = f(s_2), \\ q_1 &= f(p_1), q_2 = f(p_2), \\ V^* &= \Delta \cup D_\delta, \\ \gamma &= f(c), \gamma' = f(e). \end{aligned}$$

By the assumption, we may assume that δ is sufficiently small such that the followings hold.

(e) f can be extended to be a normal mapping f_1 defined on $\overline{\Delta^*}$.

(f) f_1 restricted to $\overline{V}$ is a homeomorphism onto the closure of a polygonal Jordan domain T.

(g) $q_1 = f(p_1)$ has a neighborhood T^* such that $T^* \supset T \cup \gamma\backslash\{t_1, t_2\}$, T^* is a polygonal Jordan domain and for the component U of $f_1^{-1}(\overline{T^*})$ with $p_1 \in U$, f_1 restricted to $\overline{U}$ is a d to 1 covering mapping onto $\overline{T^*}$, with the unique ramification point at p_1.

(h) $\beta \cap \partial T^* = \{t_2\}$.

Then there is another normal mapping $f_2 : \overline{\Delta^*} \to S$ such that

$$f_2|_{\overline{\Delta^*}\backslash U} = f_1|_{\overline{\Delta^*}\backslash U},$$

the restriction $f_2|_{\overline{U}}$ is also a d to 1 covering with a unique ramification point p_1' in U such that $p_1' \in \Delta$ and $q_1' = f_2(p_1') \in T^*\backslash\overline{T}$.

Consider the lift of the path $\gamma = f(c) = f_1(c)$ by f_2. Since $f_2|_{\overline{U}}$ is a covering with the unique ramification point p_1' with $f_2(p_1') = q_1' \notin \gamma$, $\gamma = f(c)$ has a unique lift α in $\overline{U}$ by f_2 such that the interior of α is in U with endpoints s_1 and s_2 (note that $\overline{T}$ can be lifted by $f_2|_{\overline{U}}$, because $\overline{T}$ is simple connected and there is no branched point in T). Then α divides Δ^* in to two Jordan domains Δ' and Δ'' such that $f_2(\partial\Delta'') = \gamma \cup \gamma' = \partial T$, and f_2 restricted to $\partial\Delta'' = \alpha \cup e$ is a homeomorphism onto the boundary ∂T. Then $f_2|_{\overline{\Delta''}}$ is a homeomorphism from Δ'' onto T.

Then the restriction of f_2 to $\overline{\Delta'}$ is a normal mapping such that

$$A(f_2, \Delta') = A(f_2, \Delta^*) - A(f_2, \Delta'') = A(f_1, \Delta^*) - A(T) = A(f, \Delta),$$

and Γ_f and $\Gamma_{f_2|_{\overline{\Delta'}}}$ are the same, ignoring a parameter transformation.

By (h), there exists a unique $\theta_1' \in (\theta_1, \theta_2)$ such that $t_2 = \beta(\theta_1')$, which is the unique point in $\beta \cap \partial T^*$. Let $\beta_1(\theta), \theta \in [\theta_1, \theta_1']$, be a polygonal Jordan path in $T^*\backslash T$

such that

$$\beta_1(\theta_1) = q_1', \beta_1(\theta_1') = t_2,$$

and the interior of β_1 is contained in $T^*\backslash\overline{T}$. Then since $f_2|_{\overline{U}}$ is a covering with the unique ramification point p_1' and $f_2(p_1') = q_1'$, β_1 has d lifts $\alpha_j^* = \alpha_j^*(\theta), \theta \in [\theta_1, \theta_1'], j = 1, \ldots, d$, by $f_2|_{\overline{U}}$, such that

(i) $\cup_{j=2}^d \alpha_j^* \subset \Delta'$, the interior of α_1^* is also contained in Δ^*, while $\alpha_1^*(\theta_1') = s_2 = \alpha_1(\theta_1') \in \partial\Delta'$.

(j) $\alpha_j^*(\theta_1') = \alpha_j(\theta_1')$,and $\alpha_j^*(\theta_1) = p_1', j = 1, \ldots, d$.

Let

$$\beta_2(\theta) = \begin{cases} \beta_1(\theta), \theta \in [\theta_1, \theta_1'], \\ \beta(\theta), \theta \in [\theta_1', \theta_2]; \end{cases}$$

and let

$$\alpha_j'' = \begin{cases} \alpha_j'(\theta), \theta \in [\theta_1, \theta_1'], \\ \alpha_j(\theta), \theta \in [\theta_1', \theta_2]. \end{cases}$$

Then, by the assumption of the lemma, we have

$$f_2(\alpha_j''(\theta)) = \beta_2(\theta), \theta \in [\theta_1, \theta_2], j = 1, \ldots, d$$

$$\alpha_j'' \subset \Delta', j = 2, \ldots, d,$$

and f_2 has no ramification point in $\cup_{j=1}^d \alpha_j'' \backslash \{p_1'\}$. Since $\Gamma_{f_2|_{\overline{\Delta'}}} = f_2(z), z \in \partial\Delta'$, is polygonal, there exists another polygonal Jordan path $\beta_3(\theta), \theta \in [\theta_1, \theta_2]$, such that $\beta_3 \cap \beta = \{q_2\}$, β_3 is so close to β_2 that β_3 has a number of d lifts $\gamma_j = \gamma_j(\theta), \theta \in [\theta_1, \theta_2]$ such that

$$f_2(\gamma_j(\theta)) = \beta_3(\theta), \theta \in [\theta_1, \theta_2], j = 1, \ldots, d,$$

$$\gamma_j(\theta_1) = p_1', j = 1, \ldots, d,$$

$$\cup_{j=2}^d \gamma_j \subset \Delta', \gamma\backslash\{p_2\} \subset \Delta'$$

and f_2 has no ramification point in $\cup_j^d \gamma_j \backslash \{p_1'\}$. Then by Lemma 9.2, there exists a normal mapping f_3 defined on Δ' such that the followings hold.

(k) $p_2 = e^{i\theta_2}$ is a ramification point of f_3 with $f_3(p_2) = q_2' = \beta(\theta_2)$, while p_1 is not a ramification point of f_3, and

$$b_{f_2}(p_1) = b_{f_3}(p_2),$$

(l) The boundary curves $f_3(e^{i\theta})$ and $f_2(e^{i\theta})$ are the same after a parameter transform.

(m) In $\overline{\Delta'}\backslash\{p_1', p_2\}$, f_3 and f_2 has the same set of ramification points and f and g coincide in a neighborhood of this ramification point set.

(n) $A(f_3, \Delta') = A(f_2, \Delta')$.

Let B be the set of all ramification points of f_3, then it is clear that $B\backslash p_2 \subset \Delta \cap \Delta'$. Let h be a homeomorphism from $\overline{\Delta'}$ to $\overline{\Delta}$, such that h restricted to a neighborhood of $B\backslash p_2$ is an identity, and let $g = f_2 \circ h^{-1}$. Then g is the desired mapping. $\square$

10. Cutting and Gluing Riemann surfaces of normal mappings

In this section, we will prove the following theorem, which is used in the proof of Theorem 12.1.

Theorem 10.1. *Let $f:\overline{\Delta}\to S$ be a normal mapping and assume that each natural edge of f has spherical length strictly less than π. If f has a branched point in $S\backslash E$, then there exist two normal mappings $f_j:\overline{\Delta}\to S, j=1,2,$ such that the followings hold.*

(i) Each natural edge of f_j has spherical length strictly less than $\pi, j=1,2$.

(ii) $\sum_{j=1}^{2}L(f_j,\partial\Delta)\leq L(f,\partial\Delta),\sum_{j=1}^{2}A(f_j,\Delta)\geq A(f,\Delta)$.

(iii) $V_{NE}(f_1)+V_{NE}(f_2)\leq V_{NE}(f)+2$, $V_E(f_1)+V_E(f_2)\geq V_E(f)$.

(iv) $V(f_1)+V(f_2)\leq V(f)+2$.

The proof will be put to the end of this section, after we establish some results for cutting and gluing the Riemann surface of f.

Lemma 10.1. *Let $f:\overline{\Delta}\to S$ be a normal mapping, let $p_0\in\Delta$ be a ramification point of f and let $\beta=\beta(t),t\in[0,1]$, be a polygonal Jordan path in S with distinct endpoints. Assume that the followings hold.*

(a) Each natural edge f has spherical length strictly less that π.

(b) $\beta(0)=f(p_0)$, β has two lifts $\alpha_j=\alpha_j(t),t\in[0,1]$, in $\overline{\Delta}$ by f, with

$$\alpha_j(0)=p_0 \text{ and } f(\alpha_j(t))=\beta(t),t\in[0,1],j=1,2. \tag{10.1}$$

(c) $\alpha_j(t)\in\Delta$ for all $t\in[0,1)$, $j=1,2$, but $\{\alpha_1(1),\alpha_2(1)\}\subset\partial\Delta$.

(d) f has no ramification point in the interior $\alpha_j(0,1)=\{\alpha_j(t),t\in(0,1)\},j=1,2$.

Then there exist normal mappings $f_1,f_2:\overline{\Delta}\to S$, such that the following conditions hold.

(i) Each natural edge f_j has spherical length strictly less that π, $j=1,2$.

(ii) $L(f,\Delta)\geq L(f_1,\Delta)+L(f_2,\Delta)$ and $A(f,\Delta)\leq A(f_1,\Delta)+A(f_2,\Delta)$.

(iii) $V_{NE}(f_1)+V_{NE}(f_2)\leq V_{NE}(f)+2$ and $V_E(f_1)+V_E(f_2)\geq V_E(f)$.

(iv) $V(f_1)+V(f_2)\leq V(f)+2$.

Proof. By Lemma 3.5, we have $\alpha_1(1)\neq\alpha_2(1)$, and by (b) and (d), α_1 and α_2 are Jordan paths that intersect only at p_0. Then by the assumption, $\alpha=\alpha_2^-+\alpha_1$ compose a Jordan path in $\overline{\Delta}$ from $\alpha_2(1)$ to $\alpha_1(1)$, such that the interior of α is contained in Δ. Thus, α divides the disk $\overline{\Delta}$ into two parts, of which one is on the left hand side of α and is denoted by Δ_1, and the other, denoted by Δ_2, is on the right hand side of α.

Now, we consider the restrictions

$$f|_{\overline{\Delta_j}}:\overline{\Delta}\to S,j=1,2.$$

By Lemma 3.4, these two normal mapping can be regarded as two normal mappings g_1 and g_2 defined on $\overline{\Delta}$ as follows.

Let $\gamma_j=\partial\Delta\cap\partial\Delta_j$, which is the section of the boundary of Δ_j that is on the circle $\partial\Delta$, and let $h_j:\overline{\Delta_j}\to\overline{\Delta}$ be a continuous mapping such that $h_j|_{\Delta}$ is a homeomorphism onto $\Delta_{[0,1]}=\Delta\backslash[0,1]$, in which $[0,1]$ is the interval of the real numbers, h_j maps the interior of γ_j homeomorphically onto $(\partial\Delta)\backslash\{1\}$, and

$$h_j(\alpha_j(t))=t,t\in[0,1].$$

Then define $g_j = f_j \circ h_j^{-1}$, and this is the glued mappings from $\overline{\Delta}$ into S. Then the followings hold.

(e) The boundary curves of g_1 and g_2 compose the boundary curve of f, i.e. the curve $\Gamma_{g_1} = g(z), z \in \partial\Delta$, and the section of the curve $\Gamma_f = f(z)$, in which z runs on $\partial\Delta$ from $\alpha_1(1)$ to $\alpha_2(1)$ are the same and the curve $\Gamma_{g_2} = g_2(z), z \in \partial\Delta$, and the the section of the curve $\Gamma_f = f(z)$, in which z runs on $\partial\Delta$ from $\alpha_2(1)$ to $\alpha_1(1)$ are the same; and

$$A(f,\Delta) = A(g_1,\Delta) + A(g_2,\Delta) \text{ and } L(f,\Delta) = L(g_1,\Delta) + L(g_2,\Delta). \tag{10.2}$$

Let $p_j = e^{i\theta_j}, j = 1,\dots,n$, be an enumeration of all natural vertices of f that are in order anticlockwise, let $c_j = e^{i\theta}, \theta \in [\theta_j, \theta_{j+1}]$ $(\theta_{n+1} = \theta_1 + 2\pi)$ be the section of $\partial\Delta$ from p_j to p_{j+1} and write $q_j = f(p_j)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_f &= \Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2 + \Gamma_3 + \cdots + \Gamma_n \\ &= \overline{q_1q_2} + \overline{q_2q_3} + \cdots + \overline{q_{n-1}q_n} + \overline{q_nq_1} \end{aligned} \tag{10.3}$$

is a natural partition of the boundary curve $\Gamma_f = f(e^{i\theta}), \theta \in [0, 2\pi]$, with (by (a))

$$L(\Gamma_j) < \pi, j = 1, 2, \dots, n,$$

and

$$n = V(f).$$

Without loss of generality, assume $\alpha_1(1) \in c_1$ and $\alpha_2(1) \in c_{j_0}$ for some $j_0 \le n$. Let

$$q' = f(\alpha_1(1)) = f(\alpha_2(1)).$$

Then, it is clear that the boundary curves $\Gamma_{g_j}(z), z \in \partial\Delta, j = 1, 2$, have the permitted partitions

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{g_1} &= \overline{q_{j_0}q'} + \overline{q'q_2} + \overline{q_2q_3} + \cdots + \overline{q_{j_0-1}q_{j_0}} \\ &= \Gamma_{11} + \Gamma_{12} + \Gamma_2 + \cdots + \Gamma_{j_0-1}, \end{aligned} \tag{10.4}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{g_2} &= \overline{q_1q'} + \overline{q'q_{j_0+1}} + \overline{q_{j_0+1}q_{j_0+2}} + \cdots + \overline{q_{n-1}q_n} + \overline{q_nq_1} \\ &= \Gamma_{21} + \Gamma_{22} + \Gamma_{j_0+1} + \cdots + \Gamma_n, \end{aligned} \tag{10.5}$$

respectively, such that

$$L(\Gamma_{ij}) < \pi, i, j = 1, 2,$$

where

$$\Gamma_{11} = \overline{q_{j_0}q'}, \Gamma_{12} = \overline{q'q_2}, \Gamma_{21} = \overline{q_1q'}, \Gamma_{22} = \overline{q'q_{j_0+1}}. \tag{10.6}$$

If $\alpha_1(1)$ (or $\alpha_2(1)$) is one of the endpoint of c_1 (or c_{j_0}), then the discussion is similar and easier than the followings, since in this case some of edges in (10.6) reduce to points, and the discussion is left to the reader. So, we assume $\alpha_1(1)$ is in the interior of c_1 and $\alpha_2(1)$ is in the interior of c_2. Then

$$q' \notin E.$$

and it is clear that

$$\begin{cases} V_{NE}(g_1) + V_{NE}(g_2) \le V_{NE}(f) + 2, \\ V_E(g_1) + V_E(g_2) = V_E(f), \\ V(f_1) + V(f_2) \le n + 2, \end{cases} \tag{10.7}$$

and

$$L(\Gamma_1)+L(\Gamma_{j_0}) = L(\Gamma_{11}+\Gamma_{12})+L(\Gamma_{21}+\Gamma_{22}) \tag{10.8}$$
$$= L(\Gamma_{11}+\Gamma_{22})+L(\Gamma_{21}+\Gamma_{12}).$$

Now, there are two cases need to discuss.
Case 1. $\Gamma_1' = \Gamma_{11}+\Gamma_{12} = \overline{q_{j_0}q'}+\overline{q'q_2}$ is not a natural edge of Γ_{g_1}.
Case 2. $\Gamma_1' = \Gamma_{11}+\Gamma_{12} = \overline{q_{j_0}q'}+\overline{q'q_2}$ is a natural edge of Γ_{g_1}.

In Case 1, $\Gamma_2' = \Gamma_{21}+\Gamma_{22} = \overline{q_1q'}+\overline{q'q_{j_0+1}}$ not a natural as well. Then the partitions (10.4) and (10.5) are natural partitions, since (10.3) is a natural partition, and then g_1, g_2 are the two desired mappings by (10.2) and (10.7).

In Case 2, $\Gamma_2' = \Gamma_{21}+\Gamma_{22}$ is a natural edge as well. Then

$$\Gamma_{g_1} = \Gamma_1' + \Gamma_2 + \cdots + \Gamma_{j_0-1},$$

and

$$\Gamma_{g_2} = \Gamma_2' + \Gamma_{j_0+1} + \cdots + \Gamma_n,$$

are natural partition of Γ_{g_1} and Γ_{g_2}, respectively, and then (10.7) changes into

$$\begin{cases} V_{NE}(g_1)+V_{NE}(g_2) \le V_{NE}(f), \\ V_E(g_1)+V_E(g_2) = V_E(f), \\ V(f_1)+V(f_2) = n. \end{cases} \tag{10.9}$$

If $L(\Gamma_1') < \pi$ and $L(\Gamma_2') < \pi$, then g_1 and g_2 are the desired mappings with (10.9).

If $L(\Gamma_1') \ge \pi$, then by (10.8) and the assumption of the lemma, $L(\Gamma_2') < \pi$. This is because that by the assumption of the lemma, $L(\Gamma_1')+L(\Gamma_2') = L(\Gamma_1)+L(\Gamma_{j_0}) < 2\pi$. Then applying Theorem 8.1, there exists a normal mapping $f_1 : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ such that

$$L(f_1,\Delta) \le L(g_1,\partial\Delta),\ A(f_1,\Delta) = A(g_1,\Delta),$$

and

$$V_{NE}(f_1) \le V_{NE}(g_1),\ V_E(f_1) \ge V_E(g_1)+1, V(f_1) \le V(g_1)+2,$$

and each natural edges of Γ_{f_1} has spherical length strictly less than π. Then we have by (10.2) and (10.9) that

$$L(f_1,\partial\Delta)+L(g_2,\partial\Delta) \le L(f,\partial\Delta), A(f_1.\Delta)+A(g_2,\Delta) = A(f,\Delta)$$

$$V_{NE}(f_1)+V_{NE}(g_2) \le V_{NE}(g_1)+V_{NE}(g_2) \le V_{NE}(f),$$

$$V_E(f_1)+V_E(g_2) \ge V_E(g_1)+1+V_E(g_2) = V_E(f)+1,$$

and

$$V(f_1)+V(g_2) \le V(g_1)+2+V(g_2) \le V(f)+2.$$

Thus, f_1 and g_2 is the desired mappings. This completes the proof. □

Corollary 10.1. *Assume that f, β, α_1 and α_2 satisfy all the assumptions in Lemma 10.1 and, in addition, $\beta(1) \in E$. Then there exist normal mappings $g_1, g_2 : \overline{\Delta} \to S$, such that the followings hold.*

(i) Each natural edge of Γg_j is a natural edge of $\Gamma_f, j = 1, 2,$ and each natural edge of Γ_f is a natural edge of either g_1 or g_2.

(ii) $L(g_1,\Delta)+L(g_2,\Delta) = L(f,\Delta)$ and $A(g_1,\Delta)+A(g_2,\Delta) = A(f,\Delta)$.

(iii) $V_{NE}(g_1)+V_{NE}(g_2) = V_{NE}(f), V_E(g_1)+V_E(g_2) = V_E(f),\ V(g_1)+V(g_2) = V(f)$.

(iv)

$$\sum_{p\in\overline{\Delta}\backslash g_1^{-1}(E)} b_{g_1}(p)+\sum_{p\in\overline{\Delta}\backslash g_2^{-1}(E)} b_{g_2}(p)\leq \sum_{p\in\overline{\Delta}\backslash f^{-1}(E)} b_f(p). \tag{10.10}$$

Proof. By repeating the above proof from the beginning to (10.6) and considering that, in current situation, $q'=f(\alpha(1))=f(\alpha_2(1))$ must be a natural vertex of f,g_1 and g_2, we can conclude that all the conclusion follows, except the inequality (iv).

By the assumption and the definition of g_js, it is clear that

$$b_{g_1}(0)+b_{g_2}(0)=b_f(p_0)-1. \tag{10.11}$$

Next, we show that

$$b_{g_1}(1)+b_{g_2}(1)\leq b_f(\alpha_1(1))+b_f(\alpha_2(1))+1. \tag{10.12}$$

Let l_j be the circular arc of the circle $C_j:|z-\alpha_j(1)|=\varepsilon$ inside $\overline{\Delta}$ and γ_j be the section of $\partial\Delta$ inside $C_j, j=1,2$; let l be the circular arc of the circle $C:|z-1|$ inside $\overline{\Delta}$ and γ' be the section of $\partial\Delta$ inside $C, j=1,2$; where ε is a sufficiently small positive number. Let s_1,s_2,s_1',s_2' be smooth and orientation preserved diffeomorphisms from neighborhoods of $f(a_1(1))$, $f(\alpha_2(1)),g_1(1)$ and $g_2(1)$ onto the disk Δ with

$$s_j(f(\alpha_j(1))=0, s_j'(g_j(1))=0,$$

such that they keep the angles at $f(a_1(1))$, $f(\alpha_2(1)),g_1(1)$ and $g_2(1)$ and maps $f(\gamma_1),f(\gamma_2),g_1(\gamma_1')$ and $g_2(\gamma_2')$ onto angles (broken lines) with vertices $f(a_1(1))$, $f(\alpha_2(1)),g_1(1)$ and $g_2(1)$, respectively, in $\mathbb{C}$. Then we can define the rotation numbers

$$\tau_j=\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{l_j}\frac{d\left(s_j\circ f(z)\right)}{s_j\circ f(z)} \text{ and } \tau_j'=\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{l}\frac{d\left(s_j'\circ g_j(z)\right)}{s_j'\circ g_j(z)},$$

which is invariant for sufficiently small ε, independent of s_js and s_j's by the assumption and all are positive because s_js and s_j's are orientation preserved and g_js and f are normal. It is clear that

$$\tau_1'+\tau_2'=\tau_1+\tau_2. \tag{10.13}$$

Then there exists k_j and $k_j', j=1,2$, such that

$$k_j'<\tau_j'\leq k_j'+1, k_j<\tau_j\leq k_j+1, j=1,2,$$

and then we have

$$\begin{array}{rcl} b_{g_1}(1)+b_{g_2}(1) & = & k_1'+k_2' \\ & < & \tau_1'+\tau_2'=\tau_1+\tau_2\leq k_1+k_2+2 \\ & = & b_f(\alpha(1))+b_f(\alpha_2(1))+2, \end{array}$$

but branched numbers are integers, we have (10.12).

It is clear that, by the definition of g_js

$$\sum_{p\in\overline{\Delta}\backslash\{\alpha_1(1),\alpha_2(1)\}} b_f(p)=\sum_{j=1}^{2}\sum_{p\in\overline{\Delta}\backslash\{1\}} b_{g_j}(p),$$

which, together (10.11) and (10.12), implies (10.10). □

Lemma 10.2. *Let $f : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ be a normal mapping, let $\alpha_1 = \alpha_1(\theta) = e^{i\theta}, \theta \in [\theta_1, \theta_2]$, be a section of $\partial\Delta$ and denote $\beta = \beta(\theta) = f(e^{i\theta}), \theta \in [\theta_1, \theta_2]$. Assume that the followings hold:*

(a) Each natural edge f_j has spherical length strictly less that π.

(b) β is a Jordan path with distinct endpoints and

$$\beta(\theta) \notin E \text{ for each } t \in [\theta_1, \theta_2).$$

(c) β has a lift $\alpha_2 = \alpha_2(\theta), \theta \in [\theta_1, \theta_2]$, in $\overline{\Delta}$, with $\alpha_2(\theta_1) = \alpha_1(\theta_1) = e^{i\theta_1}$, and

$$f(e^{i\theta}) = f(\alpha_1(\theta)) = \beta(\theta), \theta \in [\theta_1, \theta_2].$$

(d) f has no ramification point in the interior of α_1 and α_2.

(e) The interior of α_2, which means the open curve $\alpha_2(\theta), \theta \in (\theta_1, \theta_2)$, is contained in Δ, but $\{\alpha_2(\theta_2)\} \subset \partial\Delta$.

Then there exist two normal mappings $f_1, f_2 : \overline{\Delta} \to S$, such that the followings hold.

(i) Each natural edge f_j has spherical length strictly less that π, $j = 1, 2$.

(ii) $A(f, \Delta) \leq A(f_1, \Delta) + A(f_2, \Delta)$ and $L(f, \Delta) \geq L(f_1, \Delta) + L(f_2, \Delta)$.

(iii) $V_{NE}(f_1) + V_{NE}(f_2) \leq V_{NE}(f) + 2$, and $V_E(f_1) + V_E(f_2) \geq V_E(f)$.

(iv) $V(f_1) + V(f_2) \leq V(f) + 2$.

Proof. By Lemma 3.5, we have $\alpha_1(\theta_2) \neq \alpha_2(\theta_2)$.

α_2 divides the disk $\overline{\Delta}$ into two parts, one of which denoted by Δ_1, is on the left hand side of α_2, and the other, denoted by Δ_2, is on the right hand side. Then, α_1 is a section of $\partial\Delta_2$. By ignoring a coordinate transform, we may regard the restriction $f|_{\overline{\Delta_1}}$ as a normal mapping g_1 defined on $\overline{\Delta}$.

Consider the Jordan domain Δ_2. By Lemma 3.4, we can glue the α_1 and α_2 so that the restriction $f|_{\overline{\Delta_2}}$ can be regarded as a normal mapping $g_2 : \overline{\Delta} \to S$, as we did in the proof of Lemma 10.1. Then the followings hold:

(e) The boundary curves of g_1 and g_2 compose the boundary curve of f, i.e. the curve $\Gamma_{g_1} = g(z), z \in \partial\Delta$, and the section of the curve $\Gamma_f = f(z)$, in which z runs on $\partial\Delta$ from $\alpha_1(1)$ to $\alpha_2(1)$ are the same and the curve $\Gamma_{g_2} = g_2(z), z \in \partial\Delta$, and the the section of the curve $\Gamma_f = f(z)$, in which z runs on $\partial\Delta$ from $\alpha_2(1)$ to $\alpha_1(1)$ are the same; and

$$A(f, \Delta) = A(g_1, \Delta) + A(g_2, \Delta) \text{ and } L(f, \Delta) = L(g_1, \Delta) + L(g_2, \Delta). \tag{10.14}$$

Then, as in the proof of Lemma 10.1, there exist normal mappings $f_j : \overline{\Delta} \to S, j = 1, 2$, satisfied the conclusions. □

Corollary 10.2. *Assume that f, β, α_1 and α_2 satisfy all the assumptions in Lemma 10.2 and, in addition, $\beta(1) \in E$. Then all the conclusions of Corollary 10.1 hold.*

Proof. Repeat the above proof from the beginning to (10.14) and repeat the proof of Corollary 10.1. □

Lemma 10.3. *Let $f : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ be a normal mapping such that each natural edge of f has spherical length strictly less than π. If f has a ramification point in Δ, then, one of the following conditions (A) and (B) is satisfied.*

(A) There exists a normal mappings $f_1 : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ such that, the followings hold.

(i) The boundary curve $\Gamma_{f_1} = f_1(z), z \in \partial\Delta$, is the same as that of f.

(ii) $L(f_1, \partial\Delta) = L(f, \partial\Delta), A(f_1, \Delta) = A(f, \Delta)$.

(iii) f_1 has no ramification point in Δ.

(iv) f_1 *has at least one ramification point in* $(\partial\Delta)\backslash f_1^{-1}(E)$.

(B) There exist normal mappings $f_j:\overline{\Delta}\to S, j=1,2,$ *such that the followings hold.*

(i) Each natural edge of f_j *has spherical length strictly less than* $\pi, j=1,2$.

(ii) $\sum_{j=1}^{2}L(f_j,\partial\Delta)\le L(f,\partial\Delta),\sum_{j=1}^{2}A(f_j,\Delta)\ge A(f,\Delta)$.

(iii) $V_{NE}(f_1)+V_{NE}(f_2)\le E(f)+2$, $V_E(f_1)+V_E(f_2)\ge V_E(f)$.

(iv) $V(f_1)+V(f_2)\le V(f)+2$.

Proof. Let $p_0\in\Delta$ be any ramification point of f and let $\beta=\beta(t),t\in[0,1]$, be a polygonal Jordan path in S from $q_0=f(p_0)$ to some point $q_1\in E=\{0,1,\infty\}$ such that the interior of β does not contain any point in E. Then $\beta(0)\ne\beta(1)$, since f is normal.

We may assume that

(a) There is no branched point of f in the interior of β (otherwise, we deform β slightly).

Let $d=v_f(p_0)$. Then, by (a) and the fact that $f(\Delta)\cap E=\emptyset$ (note that f is normal) we conclude that there are only two cases:

Case 1. There exists a positive number $t_1\le 1$, such that the followings hold.

(a1) The section $\beta[0,t_1]=\{\beta(t);t\in[0,t_1]\}$ of β has two lifts $\alpha_j=\alpha_j(t),t\in[0,t_1]$, in $\overline{\Delta}$ by f, such that

$$\alpha_j(0)=p_0\text{and } f(\alpha_j(t))=\beta(t),t\in[0,t_1];j=1,2.$$

(b1) For $j=1$ and 2, $\alpha_j(t)\in\Delta$ for all $t\in[0,t_1]$, but $\{\alpha_1(t_1),\alpha_2(t_1)\}\subset\partial\Delta$.

(c1) f has no ramification point in the interior of α_1 and α_2, i.e. f has no ramification point on $\alpha_1(0,1)\cup\alpha_2(0,1)$, where $\alpha_j(0,1)$ is the open curve $\alpha_j(t),t\in(0,1)$, which is the curve α_j without end points, $j=1,2$.

Case 2. There exists a positive number $t_1\le 1$, such that the followings hold.

(a2) The section $\beta(t),t\in[0,t_1]$, of β has a number of $d=v_f(p_0)$ lifts $\alpha_j=\alpha_j(t),t\in[0,t_1]$, in $\overline{\Delta}$, such that

$$\cup_{j=2}^{d}\alpha_j\subset\Delta, \tag{10.15}$$

$$f(\alpha_j(t))=\beta(t),t\in[0,t_1],\ j=1,\dots,d,$$

and

$$\alpha_j(0)=p_0,\ j=1,\dots,d.$$

(b2) $\alpha_1(t)\in\Delta$ for all $t\in[0,t_1)$ but $p_1'=\alpha_1(t_1)\in\partial\Delta$.

In Case 1, by Lemmas 10.1, (B) is satisfied.

Now, assume Case 2 occurs. Then, we must have $t_1<1$. Otherwise, we have $f(\alpha_2(t_1))=\beta(1)=q_1\in E$, and then by the fact $f(\Delta)\cap E=\emptyset$, we have $\alpha_2(t_1)\in\partial\Delta$, contradicting (10.15). Thus by (a) we have:

(c2) f has no ramification point on $\cup_{j=1}^{d}\alpha_j(0,t_1]$, where $\alpha_j(0,t_1]$ is the curve $\alpha_j(t),t\in(0,t_1]$, which is the curve α_j without initial point, $j=1,2,\dots d$.

Then, by (a2), (b2) and (c2), Lemma 9.2 applies, and then, there exists a normal mapping $g_1:\overline{\Delta}\to S$ such that (recall that $p_1'=\alpha_1(t_1)$)

$$\#\{p\in\Delta;b_{g_1}(p)>1\}=\#\{p\in\Delta;b_f(p)>1\}-1, \tag{10.16}$$

$$b_{g_1}(p_1')=b_f(p_0) \tag{10.17}$$

$$L(g_1,\partial\Delta)=L(f,\partial\Delta),A(g_1,\Delta)=A(f,\Delta), \tag{10.18}$$

and

(d) The boundary curve of g_1 is the same as that of f.

Then, g_1 satisfies (i), (ii) of condition (A).

By (10.17), $p_1' \in \partial\Delta$ is a ramification point of g_1. On the other hand, by (b2) and (10.15)

$$g_1(\partial\Delta) \ni g_1(p_1') = f(p_1') = f(\alpha_1(t_1)) = f(\alpha_2(t_1)) \in f(\Delta),$$

,i.e. $g_1(p_1') \in g_1(\partial\Delta) \cap f(\Delta)$, and then $g_1(p_1') \notin E$ since f is normal. Thus, (iv) of (A) hold.

If g_1 does not satisfies (iii) in (A), then g_1 satisfies all assumptions of the lemma under proving, but the number of ramification points of g_1 located in Δ is dropped by one (by (10.16)), and then apply the above argument, we again reach Case 1 or Case 2. Since there are finitely many ramification point of f in Δ, after repeating the above arguments finitely many time, we can show that either (A) or (B) holds. □

Lemma 10.4. *Let $f : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ be a normal mapping such that*

(a) Each natural edge of f has length strictly less than π, and

(b) f has no ramification point in Δ.

Assume that there exist θ_1 and θ_3 with $\theta_1 < \theta_3 < \theta_1 + 2\pi$ such that the followings hold.

(c) $p_1 = e^{i\theta_1} \in \partial\Delta\backslash f^{-1}(E)$ is a ramification point of f. Note that $E = \{0, 1, \infty\}$.

(d) $f(e^{i\theta_3}) \in E$ but $f(e^{i\theta}) \notin E$ for each $\theta \in (\theta_1, \theta_3)$.

(e) Each point $e^{i\theta} \in \partial\Delta$ with $\theta \in (\theta_1, \theta_3)$ is not a ramification point of f.

Then, there exist two normal mappings $f_j : \overline{\Delta} \to S, j = 1, 2,$ such that the followings holds.

(i) Each natural edge of f_j has length strictly less than π, $j = 1, 2$.

(ii) $\sum_{j=1}^{2} L(f_j, \partial\Delta) \le L(f, \partial\Delta), \sum_{j=1}^{2} A(f_j, \Delta) \ge A(f, \Delta)$.

(iii) $V_{NE}(f_1) + V_{NE}(f_2) \le V_{NE}(f) + 2$, $V_E(f_1) + V_E(f_2) \ge V_E(f)$.

(iv) $V(f_1) + V(f_2) \le V(f) + 2$.

Proof. By the assumption, there are only two cases need to discuss.

Case 1. There exist $\theta_4, \theta_5 \in (\theta_1, \theta_2)$ with $\theta_4 < \theta_5$ such that

(f) $e^{i\theta_4}$ is a natural vertex of f.

(g) Both of the sections $\Gamma_{14} = f(e^{i\theta}), \theta \in [\theta_1, \theta_4]$, and $\Gamma_{45} = f(e^{i\theta}), \theta \in [\theta_4, \theta_5]$ are Jordan paths with $\Gamma_{14}(\theta_1) \ne \Gamma_{14}(\theta_4)$ and $\Gamma_{45}(\theta_4) \ne \Gamma_{45}(\theta_5)$, but $\Gamma_{14} + \Gamma_{45}$ is not a Jordan curve.

Case 2. The section $\Gamma_{13} = f(e^{i\theta}), \theta \in [\theta_1, \theta_3]$, is a Jordan path.

Let $d = v_f(p_0)$. We first assume Case 1 occur.

Then, there exists a positive number δ and there exist a number of d Jordan paths

$$\alpha_{j,\delta} = \alpha_{j,\delta}(\theta), \theta \in [\theta_1, \theta_{1+\delta}], j = 1, \dots, d,$$

such that

$$\alpha_{1,\delta}(\theta) = e^{i\theta}, \theta \in [\theta_1, \theta_{1+\delta}],$$
$$\alpha_{j,\delta}(\theta_1) = p_1, j = 1, \dots, d,$$
$$\alpha_{j,\delta}(\theta) \in \Delta, \theta \in (\theta_1, \theta_{1+\delta}), j = 2, 3, \dots d,$$

and

$$f(\alpha_{j,\delta}(\theta)) = f(e^{i\theta}), \theta \in [\theta_1, \theta_{1+\delta}], j = 1, \dots, d.$$

Since f has no ramification point in Δ, there are only two further cases for Case 1.

Case 1.1. Each $\alpha_{j,\delta}$ can be extended to be a Jordan path $\alpha_j = \alpha_j(\theta), \theta \in [\theta_1, \theta_4]$, such that

$$\alpha_j(\theta) \in \Delta, \theta \in (\theta_1, \theta_4], j = 2, 3, \ldots, d,$$

and

$$f(\alpha_j(\theta)) = f(e^{i\theta}), \theta \in [\theta_1, \theta_4], j = 2, 3, \ldots, d.$$

Case 1.2. For some $j_0 \in \{2, 3, \ldots, d\}$, there exists $\theta_2 \in (\theta_1, \theta_4]$ such that $\alpha_{j_0,\delta}$ can be extended to be a Jordan path $\alpha_{j_0} = \alpha_{j_0}(\theta), \theta \in [\theta_1, \theta_2]$, such that

$$\alpha_{j_0}(\theta_2) \in \partial\Delta,$$
$$\alpha_{j_0}(\theta) \in \Delta, \theta \in (\theta_1, \theta_2),$$
$$f(\alpha_{j_0}(\theta)) = f(e^{i\theta}), \theta \in [\theta_1, \theta_2].$$

In Case 1.1, since f has no ramification point in Δ, f has no ramification point in the interior of each $\alpha_j, j = 2, \ldots, d$, and then $f, \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_d$ and $\beta = f(e^{i\theta}), \theta \in [\theta_1, \theta_4]$ satisfy all assumptions of Lemma 9.3 by (e). Then Lemma 9.3 apply, and then there exists a normal mapping $g : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ such that

$$g(e^{i\theta}) = f(e^{i\theta}), \theta \in [0, 2\pi],$$
$$b_g(p_1) = 0, b_g(p_2) = b_f(p_1),$$
$$b_g(p) = b_f(p) \text{ for all } p \in \overline{\Delta}\backslash\{p_1, p_2\},$$

and

$$L(g, \partial\Delta) = L(f, \partial\Delta), A(g, \Delta) = A(f, \Delta).$$

Then g satisfies all the assumptions in the lemma under proving by replacing θ_1 with θ_4. But now, the number of loops of the section $g(e^{i\theta}), \theta \in [\theta_4, \theta_3]$, is dropped by one. Then, by repeating the same argument several times, we can find a number $\theta_1' \in [\theta_1, \theta_3)$, and a normal mapping $f_1 : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ such that

$$f_1(e^{i\theta}) = f(e^{i\theta}), \theta \in [0, 2\pi],$$

f_1, $\theta_1 = \theta_1'$ and θ_3 satisfy all assumptions of the lemma and fit case Case 2.

In Case 1.2, f also has no ramification point in the interior of each $\alpha_j, j = 1, j_0$. Without loss of generality, we assume $j_0 = 2$. Then, $f, \alpha_1, \alpha_2 = \alpha_{j_0}$ and $\beta = \beta = f(e^{i\theta}), \theta \in [\theta_1, \theta_2]$, satisfy all assumptions of Lemma 10.2. Then by Lemmas 10.2, There exist two normal mappings $f_1, f_2 : \overline{\Delta} \to S$, satisfying (i)–(ii).

Now assume Case 2 occurs. Then since $f(\Delta) \cap E = \emptyset$ (note that f is normal), by (a)–(e), there exists $\theta_2 \in (\theta_1, \theta_3]$ such that the sections $\alpha_1 = e^{i\theta}$ and $\beta = f(e^{i\theta})$ with $\theta \in [\theta_1, \theta_2]$ satisfy all assumptions of Lemma 10.2, and the arguments in Case 1.2 apply. This completes the proof. □

Proof of Theorem10.1. Assume f has a branched point in $f(\overline{\Delta})\backslash E$. There are two cases:

Case 1. f has a ramification point in Δ.

Case 2. f has no ramification point in Δ, but has a ramification point in $\partial\Delta\backslash f^{-1}(E)$.

In Case 1, Lemma 10.3 applies, and we have the following conclusions (A) or (B).

(A) There exists a normal mappings $g_1 : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ such that, the followings hold.

(1) The boundary curve $\Gamma_{g_1} = g_1(z), z \in \partial\Delta$, is the same as that of f.

(2) $L(g_1, \partial\Delta) = L(f, \partial\Delta), A(g_1, \Delta) = A(f, \Delta)$.

(3) g_1 has no ramification point in Δ.

(4) g_1 has at least one branched point in $f(\partial\Delta)\backslash E$.

(B) The conclusions of Theorem 10.1 hold true.

If (A) occurs, then g_1 has a ramification point $p_1 \in (\partial\Delta) \backslash f^{-1}(E)$, and then we can found θ_1 and θ_3 such that g_1, θ_1 and θ_3 satisfy all assumptions of Lemma 10.4, and then (B) holds.

In Case 2, Lemma 10.4applies, and so, the conclusions of Theorem 10.1 hold true again. $\square$

11. Deformation of normal mappings that have nonconvex vertices

In this section we will prove the following theorem, which is used to prove Theorem 12.1. Theorem 12.1 is the first key step to prove the main theorem.

Theorem 11.1. *Let $f : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ be a normal mapping and assume that each natural edge of Γ_f has length strictly less than π. If Γ_f is not convex at some natural vertex q and $q \notin E$. Then there exists a normal mapping $g : \overline{\Delta} \to S$, such that*

$$L(g, \partial\Delta) \leq L(f, \partial\Delta), A(g, \Delta) \geq A(f, \Delta),$$

each natural edge of g has spherical length strictly less than π, and

$$V_{NE}(g) \leq V_{NE}(f) - 1,\ V_E(g) \geq V_E(f) \text{ and } V(g) \leq V(f) + 1.$$

Proof. We divide the proof into four parts, which is the coming Lemmas 11.1–11.4. $\square$

Before we introduce these lemmas, we first make some conventions.

We fix the normal mapping $f : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ and assume

$$\Gamma_f = \Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2 + \Gamma_3 + \cdots + \Gamma_n \tag{11.1}$$

is a natural partition of Γ_f, with $n = V(f)$,

$$\partial\Delta = \gamma_1 + \cdots + \gamma_n$$

is the corresponding natural partition of $\partial\Delta$ for f, and denote by $p_j = e^{i\theta_j}, j = 1, \ldots, n$, the initial point of $\gamma_j, j = 1, \ldots, n$, with $\theta_{j+1} = \theta_1$ and

$$\theta_1 < \theta_2 < \cdots < \theta_n < \theta_1 + 2\pi;$$

and assume that

(I) All natural edges of f has spherical length strictly less than π.

Then, $q_j = f(p_j)$ is the initial point of Γ_j for each $j = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, and by (I), the notation $\overline{q_j q_{j+1}}$ makes sense, which is the unique shortest path from q_j to q_{j+1}, and $\Gamma_j = \overline{q_j q_{j+1}}, j = 1, 2, \ldots, n$. Therefore, the natural partition (11.1) can be written

$$\Gamma_f = \overline{q_1 q_2} + \overline{q_2 q_3} + \cdots + \overline{q_{n-1} q_n}.$$

We will also assume that

(II) $\Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2$ is not convex at $q_2 \notin E$.

The assumption (II) means that either $\Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2$ can be regarded as a perigon angle, or the oriented triangle $\overline{q_1 q_3 q_2 q_1}$ is a convex triangle. When $\Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2$ is a perigon angle, there is only one case need to discuss.

Case A. $q_3 \in \Gamma_1 = \overline{q_1 q_2}$ or $q_1 \in \Gamma_2 = \overline{q_2 q_3}$.

When $\overline{q_1 q_3 q_2 q_1}$ is a convex triangle, it encloses a triangle domain T that is on the right hand side of $\Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2$, and there are only three cases need to discuss:

Case B. $\left(\overline{\mathbf{T}} \backslash \{q_1, q_3\}) \cap E\right) = \emptyset$.

Case C. There is only one point q_1' in $E = \{0, 1, \infty\}$ that is located in $\overline{T} \backslash \{\Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2\}$.

Case D. There exist two points q_1' and q_1'' in $E = \{0, 1, \infty\}$ that is located in the triangle domain T.

Under these settings, we can execute deformations of f which will be stated in the following Lemmas 11.1–11.4.

Lemma 11.1. *In Case A, there exists a normal mapping* $g : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ *such that*

$$L(g, \partial\Delta) < L(f, \partial\Delta) \text{ and } A(g, \Delta) \geq A(f, \Delta), \tag{11.2}$$

each natural edge of Γ_g *has spherical length strictly less than* π, *and*

$$V_{NE}(g) \leq V_{NE}(f) - 1, V_E(g) \geq V_E(f), V(g) = V(f). \tag{11.3}$$

Proof. Assume Case A occurs. Then, without loss of generality, we may assume $q_3 \in \Gamma_1$. Let $p' = e^{i\theta_1'}$, $\theta_1' \in (\theta_1, \theta_2)$, such that $f(p') = q_3$. Then we can glue the section of $\partial\Delta$ from p' to p_2 and the section of $\partial\Delta$ from p_2 to p_3 and regard f as a mapping g of the glued closed set, which can be regard as a closed disk, such that the boundary curve of g has a permitted partition

$$\Gamma_g = \Gamma_1' + \Gamma_3 + \cdots + \Gamma_n, \tag{11.4}$$

where $\Gamma' = \overline{q_1 q'} = \overline{q_1 q_3}$ is the section of Γ_1 from $q_1 = f(p_1)$ to $q' = f(p') = q_3$, and

$$L(g, \partial\Delta) < L(f, \partial\Delta), \ A(g, \Delta) = A(f, \Delta). \tag{11.5}$$

By (11.4), we have (11.3).

If (11.4) is a natural partition, then g also satisfies (I) and then g is the desired mapping.

Assume that (11.4) is not a natural partition, which is only in the case that

$$\Gamma_1'' = \Gamma_1' + \Gamma_3 = \overline{q_1 q_3} + \overline{q_3 q_4}$$

is a natural edge of Γ_g .

But in this case,

$$\Gamma_g = \Gamma_1'' + \Gamma_4 + \cdots + \Gamma_n$$

is a natural partition, and then we have

$$V_{NE}(g) = V_{NE}(f) - 2, V_E(g) = V_E(f), \ V(g) = V(f) - 2. \tag{11.6}$$

By (I) we have

$$L(\Gamma_1'') < 2\pi.$$

If $L(\Gamma_1'') < \pi$, then g already satisfies all the conclusions of Lemma 11.1.

If $L(\Gamma_1'') \geq \pi$, then g satisfies (a) or (b) of Theorem 8.1, and then there exists a normal mapping $f_1 : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ such that

$$L(f_1, \partial\Delta) \leq L(g, \partial\Delta), A(f_1, \Delta) \geq A(g, \Delta),$$

each natural edge of f_1 has spherical length strictly less than π, and

$$V_{NE}(f_1) \leq V_{NE}(g), V_E(f_1) \geq V_E(g) + 1, V(f_1) \leq V(g) + 2.$$

Then by (11.5) and (11.6) we have

$$L(f_1, \partial\Delta) < L(f, \partial\Delta), A(f_1, \Delta) \geq A(f, \Delta),$$

and

$$V_{NE}(f_1) \leq V_{NE}(f) - 2, V_E(f_1) \geq V_E(f) + 1 > V_E(f), V(f_1) \leq V(f).$$

Thus, f_1 satisfies all the conclusion of Lemma 11.1. □

Lemma 11.2. *In Case B, there exists a normal mapping $g:\overline{\Delta}\to S$ such that*

$$L(g,\partial\Delta)<L(f,\partial\Delta) \text{ and } A(g,\Delta)>A(f,\Delta),$$

each natural edge of Γ_g has spherical length strictly less than π, and

$$V_{NE}(g)\le V_{NE}(f)-1,\ V_E(g)\ge V_E(f), V(g)\le V(f).$$

Proof. Putting

$$\Gamma_1'=\overline{q_1q_3},$$

by (I) and (II), we have

$$L(\Gamma_1')=L(\overline{q_1q_3})<\pi. \tag{11.7}$$

as in the previous proof, by Lemma 3.2, there exists a normal mapping g, which will be regarded as an extension of f, such that Γ_g has the permitted partition

$$\Gamma_g=\Gamma_1'+\Gamma_3+\cdots+\Gamma_n, \tag{11.8}$$

and

$$L(g,\partial\Delta)<L(f,\partial\Delta), A(g,\Delta)>A(f,\Delta).$$

Then

$$V_{NE}(g)\le V_{NE}(f)-1, V_E(g)=V_E(f), V(g)\le V(f)-1,$$

and there are four cases:

Case 1. Neither $\overline{q_nq_1q_3}$ nor $\overline{q_1q_3q_4}$ is a natural edge of Γ_g.

Case 2. $\overline{q_nq_1q_3}$ is a natural edge of Γ_g, while $\overline{q_1q_3q_4}$ is not.

Case 3. $\overline{q_nq_1q_3}$ is not a natural edge of Γ_g, while $\overline{q_1q_3q_4}$ is.

Case 4. Both $\overline{q_nq_1q_3q_4}$ is a natural edge of Γ_g.

In Case 1, (11.8) is a natural partition, and g is the desired mapping.

In Case 2, g has a natural partition

$$\Gamma_g=\Gamma_1''+\Gamma_3+\cdots+\Gamma_{n-1},$$

where $\Gamma_1''=\Gamma_n+\Gamma_1'=\overline{q_nq_1q_3}$, and it is clear that

$$V_{NE}(g)=V_{NE}(f)-2, V_E(g)=V_E(f), V(g)=V(f)-2,$$

and by (I) and (11.7),

$$L(\Gamma_1'')<2\pi. \tag{11.9}$$

If $L(\Gamma_1'')<\pi$, the g satisfies all the conclusions.

If $L(\Gamma_1'')\ge\pi$, then by (I), (11.9) and Theorem 8.1 for the cases (a) and (b), there exists a normal mapping $f_1:\overline{\Delta}\to S$ such that

$$L(f_1,\partial\Delta)\le L(g,\partial\Delta), A(f_1,\Delta)\ge A(g,\Delta),$$

each natural edge of f_1 has spherical length strictly less than π, and

$$V_{NE}(f_1)\le V_{NE}(g_1),\ V_E(f_1)\ge V_E(g)+1, V(f_1)\le V(g)+2.$$

Then f_1 satisfies all the desired conditions in the lemma with

$$V_{NE}(f_1)\le V_{NE}(f)-2, V_E(f_1)\ge V_E(f)+1 \text{ and } V(f_1)\le V(f).$$

Case 3 can be treated as Case 2.

In case 4 we have

$$V_{NE}(g)=V_{NE}(f)-3, V_E(g)=V_E(f), V(g)=V(f)-3, \tag{11.10}$$

and g has a natural partition

$$\Gamma_g=\Gamma_1'''+\Gamma_4+\cdots+\Gamma_{n-1}, \tag{11.11}$$

where

$$\Gamma_1''' = \overline{q_nq_1} + \overline{q_1q_3} + \overline{q_3q_4} = \Gamma_n + \Gamma_1' + \Gamma_3.$$

Then by (I) and (11.7) we have

$$\Gamma_1''' < 3\pi. \tag{11.12}$$

If $L(\Gamma_1''') < \pi$, then by (I), (11.10) and (11.11), g is the desire mapping.

If $L(\Gamma_1''') \geq \pi$, then by (I), (11.11) and Theorem 8.1 (a), (b) and (d), there exists a normal mapping $g_1 : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ such that

$$L(g_1, \partial\Delta) \leq L(g, \partial\Delta), A(g_1, \Delta) \geq A(g, \Delta),$$

each natural edge of g_1 has spherical length strictly less than π, and

$$V_{NE}(g_1) \leq V_{NE}(g_1) + 2,\ V_E(g_1) \geq V_E(g) + 1, V(g_1) \leq V(g) + 3.$$

Then g_1 satisfies all the desired conditions in the lemma with (by (11.10))

$$V_{NE}(g_1) \leq V_{NE}(f) - 1, V_E(g_1) \geq V_E(f) + 1 \text{ and } V(g_1) \leq V(f).$$

This completes the proof. □

Lemma 11.3. *In Cases C, there exists a normal mapping $g : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ such that*

$$L(g, \partial\Delta) < L(f, \partial\Delta) \text{ and } A(g, \Delta) > A(f, \Delta),$$

each natural edge of Γ_g has spherical length strictly less than π, and

$$V_{NE}(g) \leq V_{NE}(f) - 1, V_E(g) \geq V_E(f) + 1 \text{ and } V(g) \leq V(f).$$

Proof. Assume Case C occurs and let $\Gamma_1' = \overline{q_1q_1'}$ and $\Gamma_2' = \overline{q_1'q_2}$. Then, considering that q_1, q_1', q_2 are contained in the closure of the triangle domain T which in on the left hand side of the convex triangle $\overline{q_1q_3q_2q_1}$, we have

$$L(\Gamma_1') < \pi, L(\Gamma_2') < \pi,\ L(\Gamma_1' + \Gamma_2') < L(\Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2), \tag{11.13}$$

and it is clear that

$$\Gamma_1' + \Gamma_2' - \Gamma_2 - \Gamma_1$$

is a quadrilateral and encloses a domain T' in T that is on the right hand side of $\Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2$. Then, by (11.13), replacing the the domain T in the proof of Lemma 11.2 by T' and repeating the extension arguments, we can obtain a normal mapping $g : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ such that

$$L(g, \partial\Delta) < L(f, \partial\Delta) \text{ and } A(g, \Delta) > A(f, \Delta), \tag{11.14}$$

and the boundary curve Γ_g of g has the following permitted partition

$$\Gamma_g = \Gamma_1' + \Gamma_2' + \Gamma_3 + \cdots + \Gamma_n,$$

which implies another permitted partition

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_g &= \Gamma_n + \Gamma_1' + \Gamma_2' + \Gamma_3 + \cdots + \Gamma_{n-1}. \\ &= \overline{q_nq_1} + \overline{q_1q_1'} + \overline{q_1'q_2} + \overline{q_2q_3} + \cdots + \overline{q_{n-1}q_n}. \end{aligned} \tag{11.15}$$

But here the terminal point q_1' of Γ_1', which is the initial point of Γ_2', is in E, and so we have

$$V_{NE}(g) \leq V_{NE}(f) - 1, V_E(g) = V_E(f) + 1 \text{ and } V(g) \leq V(f).$$

Now, there are four cases need to discuss.

Case 1. Neither $\Gamma_n + \Gamma_1' = \overline{q_nq_1q_1'}$ nor $\Gamma_2' + \Gamma_3 = \overline{q_1'q_2q_3}$ is a natural edge of Γ_g.

Case 2. $\overline{q_nq_1q_1'}$ is a natural edge of Γ_g, while $\overline{q_1'q_2q_3}$ is not.

Case 3. $\overline{q_nq_1q_1'}$ is a natural edge of Γ_g, while $\overline{q_1'q_2q_3}$ is not.

Case 4. Both $\overline{q_nq_1q_1'}$ and $\overline{q_1'q_2q_3}$ are natural edges of Γ_g.

In Case 1, (11.15) is a natural partition, and g is the desired mapping.

In Case 2, g has the natural partition

$$\Gamma_g = \Gamma_1'' + \Gamma_2' + \Gamma_3 + \cdots + \Gamma_{n-1},$$

where $\Gamma_1'' = \Gamma_n + \Gamma_1' = \overline{q_nq_1q_1'}$, and it is clear that

$$V_{NE}(g) = V_{NE}(f) - 2, V_E(g) = V_E(f) + 1 \text{ and } V(g) = V(f) - 1. \tag{11.16}$$

and by (I) and (11.13)

$$L(\Gamma_1'') < 2\pi.$$

If $L(\Gamma_1'') < \pi$, then g is the desired mapping with (11.16).

If $\pi \leq L(\Gamma_1'') < 2\pi$, then by (I) and Theorem 8.1 (a) (note that $q_1' \in E$ is the terminal point of Γ_1''), there exists a normal mapping $g_1 : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ such that

$$L(g_1, \partial\Delta) \leq L(g, \partial\Delta), A(g_1, \Delta) \geq A(g, \Delta),$$

each natural edge of g_1 has spherical length strictly less than π, and

$$V_{NE}(g_1) \leq V_{NE}(g),\ V_E(g_1) \geq V_E(g) + 1 \text{ and } V(f_1) \leq V(g) + 1.$$

Then, by (11.14) and (11.16), g_1 satisfies all the desired conclusions in Lemma 11.3 with

$$V_{NE}(f_1) \leq V_{NE}(f) - 2,\ V_E(f_1) \geq V_E(f) + 2 \text{ and } V(f_1) \leq V(f).$$

Case 3 can be treated as Case 2.

In case 4 we have

$$V_{NE}(g) = V_{NE}(f) - 3, V_E(g) = V_E(f) + 1 \text{ and } V(g) \leq V(f) - 3 \tag{11.17}$$

and g has a natural partition

$$\Gamma_g = \Gamma_1'' + \Gamma_2'' + \Gamma_4 + \cdots + \Gamma_{n-1}, \tag{11.18}$$

where $\Gamma_1'' = \Gamma_n + \Gamma_1' = \overline{q_nq_1q_1'}$ and $\Gamma_2'' = \Gamma_2' + \Gamma_3 = \overline{q_1'q_2q_3}$. By (11.13) and (I), we have

$$L(\Gamma_1'') < 2\pi, L(\Gamma_2'') < 2\pi. \tag{11.19}$$

If

$$L(\Gamma_1'') < \pi, L(\Gamma_2'') < \pi, \tag{11.20}$$

then by (I), (11.14), (11.17) and (11.18), g is the desired mapping.

If (11.20) does not hold, then by (I), (11.18), (11.19) and the fact that both Γ_1'' and Γ_2'' have endpoints in E, Theorem 8.1 (a) or (c) applies to g, and then, there exists a normal mapping $f_1 : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ such that

$$L(f_1, \partial\Delta) \leq L(g, \partial\Delta), A(f_1, \Delta) \geq A(g, \Delta),$$

each natural edge of f_1 has spherical length strictly less than π, and

$$V_{NE}(f_1) \leq V_{NE}(g_1),\ V_E(f_1) \geq V_E(g) + 1, \text{ and } V(f_1) \leq V(g) + 2.$$

Then f_1 satisfies all the desired conclusions of Lemma 11.3 with (by (11.17))

$$V_{NE}(f_1) \leq V_{NE}(f) - 3,\ V_E(f_1) \geq V_E(f) \text{ and } V(f_1) \leq V(f) - 1.$$

This completes the proof. □

Lemma 11.4. *In Case D, there exists a normal mapping* $g:\overline{\Delta}\to S$ *such that*

$$L(g,\partial\Delta)<L(f,\partial\Delta) \text{ and } A(g,\Delta)>A(f,\Delta),$$

each natural edge of Γ_g *has spherical length strictly less than* π, *and*

$$V_{NE}(g)\le V_{NE}(f)-1, V_E(g)\ge V_E(f)+1 \text{ and } V(g)\le V(f)+1.$$

Proof. In Case D, $q_1'\in T$ and $q_2'\in T$ are the only points in $\overline{T}\cap E$. Let L be the line segment in $\overline{T}$ that passes through q_1' and q_2' and has endpoints in ∂T. Then there are two cases:

Case 1. L intersects $\overline{q_1q_3}$.

Case 2. L does not intersect $\overline{q_1q_3}$.

Assume Case 1 occurs and, without loss of generality, assume q_2' is closer to $\overline{q_1q_3}$ than q_1'. Let $\Gamma_1'=\overline{q_1q_1'}$ and $\Gamma_2'=\overline{q_1'q_2}$ (a)). Then Γ_1' and Γ_2' satisfy all the conditions in the proof of Lemma 11.3, and in this case, we can prove Lemma 11.4 by exactly repeating the proof of Lemma 11.3.

Assume Case 2 occurs. Then one endpoint q_1'' of L is in the interior of Γ_1 and the other endpoint q_2'' of L is in the interior of Γ_2. Without loss of generality, assume q_1'',q_1',q_2 and q_2'' are arranged in order on L. Let $\Gamma_1'=\overline{q_1q_1'},\Gamma''=\overline{q_1'q_2'}$ and $\Gamma_2'=\overline{q_2'q_3}$. Then, considering that T is on the left hand side of the convex triangle $\overline{q_1q_3q_2q_1}$, we have that

$$L(\Gamma_1')<\pi, L(\Gamma'')=\frac{\pi}{2}, L(\Gamma_2')<\pi,$$
$$L(\Gamma_1'+\Gamma''+\Gamma_2')<L(\Gamma_1+\Gamma_2);$$

and the domain T enclosed by $\Gamma_1'+\Gamma''+\Gamma_2'-\Gamma_2-\Gamma_1$ is a polygonal Jordan domain on the right hand side of $\Gamma_1+\Gamma_2$ with

$$\overline{T}\cap E=\{q_1,q_2\}.$$

Then by Lemma 3.2 and the extension arguments, there exists a normal mapping $g:\overline{\Delta}\to S$ such that

$$L(g,\partial\Delta)<L(f,\partial\Delta) \text{ and } A(g,\Delta)>A(f,\Delta).$$

and Γ_g has a permitted partition

$$\Gamma_g=\Gamma_1'+\Gamma''+\Gamma_2'+\Gamma_3+\cdots+\Gamma_n,$$

which implies the following permitted partition

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_g &= \Gamma_n+\Gamma_1'+\Gamma''+\Gamma_2'+\Gamma_3+\cdots+\Gamma_{n-1}\\ &= \overline{q_nq_1}+\overline{q_1q_1'}+\overline{q_1'q_2'}+\overline{q_2'q_3}+\overline{q_2q_3}+\cdots+\overline{q_{n-1}q_n}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $q_1',q_2'\in E$, it is clear that

$$V_{NE}(g)\le V_{NE}(f)-1, V_E(g)\ge V_E(f)+2 \text{ and } V(g)\le V(f)+1.$$

Now, there are four cases:

Case 2.1. None of $\Gamma_n+\Gamma_1'=\overline{q_nq_1q_1'}$ and $\Gamma''+\Gamma_2'=\overline{q_1'q_2'q_3}$ is a natural edge of Γ_g.

Case 2.2. $\overline{q_nq_1q_1'}$ is a natural edge of Γ_g, while $\overline{q_1'q_2'q_3}$ is not.

Case 2.3. $\overline{q_nq_1q_1'}$ is not a natural edge of Γ_g, while $\overline{q_1'q_2'q_3}$ is.

Case 2.4. Both $\overline{q_nq_1q_1'}$ and $\overline{q_1'q_2'q_3}$ are natural edges of Γ_g.

The discussion for these cases is almost the same as that for the four Cases 1–4 in the proof of Lemma 11.3, just with a little difference which leads to that the desired mapping may has a number of $V(f)+1$ natural edges. $\square$

12. Decomposition and deformation of Riemann surfaces of normal mappings

In this section, we prove the following theorem, which is the first key step to prove the main theorem in Section 14.

Theorem 12.1. *Let* $f:\overline{\Delta}\to S$ *be a normal mapping and assume that each natural edge of* f *has spherical length strictly less than* π. *Then, there exist a finite number of normal mappings* $f_j:\overline{\Delta}\to S, j=1,\dots m,$ *with* $m\geq 1$, *such that*

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m}L(f_j,\partial\Delta)\leq L(f,\partial\Delta),\sum_{j=1}^{m}A(f_j,\Delta)\geq A(f,\Delta),$$

and for each $j\leq m$ *the followings hold.*

(i) Each natural edge of f_j *has spherical length strictly less than* π.

(ii) The boundary curve $\Gamma_{f_j}=f_j(z),z\in\partial\Delta$, *is locally convex in* $S\backslash E$, *where* $E=\{0,1,\infty\}$.

(iii) f_j *has no branched point in* $S\backslash E$.

We first prove several lemmas before we prove this theorem.

Lemma 12.1. *Let* $f:\overline{\Delta}\to S$ *be a normal mapping and assume that each natural edge of* $\Gamma_f=f(z),z\in\partial\Delta$, *has spherical length strictly less than* π. *Then* $V(f)\geq 3$, *and if in addition* $V_{NE}(f)=0$, *then* $V(f)\geq 4$.

Proof. If $V(f)=1$, then Γ_f itself is a natural edge that is a straight and closed curve in S, and $L(f,\partial\Delta)<\pi$. This is impossible.

Assume $V(f)=2$ and $\Gamma_f=\Gamma_1+\Gamma_2$ is a natural partition. Since Γ_f is a closed curve, $L(\Gamma_j)<\pi$ and Γ_j is straight, $j=1,2$, we have $\Gamma_1=-\Gamma_2$ (ignoring a transformation of parameter) with $L(\Gamma_1)=L(\Gamma_2)<\pi$. Then, $S\backslash\Gamma_f$ contains at least one point in $E=\{0,1,\infty\}$. Considering that f is normal, we conclude that $f(\Delta)\supset S\backslash\Gamma_f$ contains at least one point of E, which contradicts the assumption that f is normal. Thus, $V(f)\geq 3$.

If in addition $V_{NE}(f)=0$, then by the assumption, each natural edge of Γ_f must be $\overline{0,1},\overline{1,0},\overline{1,\infty}$ or $\overline{\infty,1}$, and then since Γ_f is a closed curve and $V(f)\geq 3$, we have $V(f)\geq 4$. □

Lemma 12.2. *Let* $f:\overline{\Delta}\to S$ *be a normal mapping and assume that the followings hold.*

(a) each natural edge of $\Gamma_f=f(z),z\in\partial\Delta$, *has spherical length strictly less than* π.

(b) $V(f)=3$.

Then $f:\overline{\Delta}\to f(\overline{\Delta})$ *is a homeomorphism and* Γ_f *is a generic convex triangle.*

Proof. Let

$$\alpha=\alpha_1+\alpha_2+\alpha_2$$

be a natural partition of $\partial\Delta$ for f and let

$$\Gamma_f=\overline{q_1q_2}+\overline{q_2q_3}+\overline{q_3q_1}$$

be the corresponding natural partition of $\Gamma_f=f(z),z\in\partial\Delta$. Then by (a), f restricted to each α_j is a homeomorphism onto $\Gamma_j=\overline{q_jq_{j+1}}$, where $q_4=q_1$.

We first show that $\overline{q_1q_2q_3}$ can not be contained in any great circle of S. Otherwise, by (a) and the definition of natural edges, either $q_3\in\overline{q_1q_2}^{\circ}$ or $q_1\in\overline{q_2q_3}^{\circ}$, where

$\overline{q_1q_2}^\circ$ denotes the interior of $\overline{q_1q_2}$. But in the first case, q_3 is not a natural vertex of Γ_f and in the second case, q_1 is not a natural vertex of Γ_f. Thus $\overline{q_1q_2q_3}$ is not contained in any great circle of S.

Then Γ_f must be a triangle that is contained in some open hemisphere S' of S and f maps $\partial\Delta$ homeomorphically onto Γ_f and then, since f is normal, $f : \overline{\Delta} \to \overline{T}$ is a homeomorphism, where T is the domain inside Γ_f. Since f is normal, we also have $f(\Delta) \cap E = \emptyset$. Thus, $\overline{T} \subset S'$ and then Γ_f is a generic convex triangle. □

Lemma 12.3. *Let $f : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ be a normal mapping such that each natural edge of f has spherical length strictly less than π. If $V_{NE}(f) = 0$, then $L(f, \partial\Delta) \geq 2\pi$, and if $V_{NE}(f) = 1$, then $L(f, \partial\Delta) \geq \pi$.*

Proof. If $V_{NE}(f) = 0$, then by Lemma 12.1, $V(f) \geq 4$, and in this case each natural edge of $\Gamma_f = f(z), z \in \partial\Delta$, has spherical length $\frac{\pi}{2}$, and then $L(f, \partial\Delta) \geq 2\pi$. If $V_{NE}(f) = 1$, then by Lemma 12.1, $V(f) \geq 3$, and then $f(\partial\Delta)$ contains at least two point of E; and since Γ_f is closed, we have $L(f, \partial\Delta) \geq \pi$. □

Lemma 12.4. *Let $f : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ be a normal mapping and let p_0 be a ramification point of f. Assume $\beta = \overline{q_0q_1} \subset S$ satisfies the followings.*

(a) $q_0 = f(p_0)$ and $q_1 \in E = \{0, 1, \infty\}$.

(b) The interior β° of β has a neighborhood N in S such that N is a polygonal Jordan domain and f has no branched point in N.

(c) The boundary curve $\Gamma_f = \Gamma_f(z), z \in \partial\Delta$, has no natural vertex in N.

(d) Either

$$f(\partial\Delta) \cap N = \emptyset, \tag{12.1}$$

or

$$p_0 \in \partial\Delta \text{ and } f(\partial\Delta) \cap N = \beta^\circ. \tag{12.2}$$

Then there exist normal mappings $g_1, g_2 : \overline{\Delta} \to S$, such that the followings hold.

(i) Each natural edge of Γg_j is a natural edge of $\Gamma_f, j = 1, 2$, and each natural edge of Γ_f is a natural edge of either g_1 or g_2.

(ii) $L(g_1, \Delta) + L(g_2, \Delta) = L(f, \Delta)$ and $A(g_1, \Delta) + A(g_2, \Delta) = A(f, \Delta)$.

(iii) $V_{NE}(g_1) + V_{NE}(g_2) = V_{NE}(f), V_E(g_1) + V_E(g_2) = V_E(f)$, $V(g_1) + V(g_2) = V(f)$.

Proof. By Lemma 3.3 or Corollary 3.1, there exist a point q_2 in β° such that the section $\overline{q_0q_2}$ of $\beta = \overline{q_0q_1}$ has a lift $\gamma \subset \overline{\Delta}$ from p_0 to some point $p_2 \in \Delta$ with $\gamma \backslash \{p_0\} \subset \Delta$. Let $q^* \in \beta$ be the closest point to q_1 in β such that the section $\overline{q_0q^*}$ has a lift α_2 that is an extension of the lift γ and that $\alpha_2^\circ \subset \Delta$. We show that $q^* = q_1$.

Let p^* be the terminal point of α_2. Assume $q^* \neq q_1$, i.e. $q^* \in \beta^\circ$. If $p^* \in \Delta$, then by (b) and Lemma 3.3, α_2 can be extended past p^* to be a longer lift so that the extended part is still in Δ, which contradicts the definition of p^* and q^*. Thus, we have $p^* \in \partial\Delta$.

Then by (c) and the definition of natural vertices there is a neighborhood A_{p^*} of p^* in $\partial\Delta$, such that f restricted to A_{p^*} is a homeomorphism onto a section of β°. On the other hand, by (b), (c) and Lemma 3.3, there is a neighborhood U_{p^*} of p^* in $\overline{\Delta}$ such that f restricted to U_{p^*} is a homeomorphism onto $f(U_{p^*})$ with $f(U_{p^*}) \subset N$ and $f(U_{p^*})$ is a half-disc whose boundary diameter is contained in $\beta^\circ \cap f(U_{p^*})$. Thus, by (d), $U_{p^*} \cap \partial\Delta = U_{p^*} \cap f^{-1}([0, +\infty])$, and then $\alpha_2 \cap U_{p^*} \subset U_{p^*} \cap \partial\Delta$. This is a contradiction, since $\alpha_2^\circ \subset \Delta$. Thus we have proved that α_2 is a lift of the whole path β with $\alpha_2^\circ \subset \Delta$.

Since p_0 is a ramification point, in case $p_0 \in \Delta$, by Lemma 3.3, β has another lift α_1 starting from p_0 such that $\alpha_1^\circ \subset \Delta$. Since $f(\Delta) \cap E = \emptyset$ and the terminal point q_1 of β is in E, the terminal points of α_1 and α_2 must land on $\partial\Delta$, and by Lemma 3.5, these terminal points are distinct each other. Thus, f, α_1, α_2 and β satisfy all assumptions of Corollary 10.1, and then the desired g_1 and g_2 follow.

In case (12.2), by (c) there is a section α_1 of $\partial\Delta$ starting from p_0 so that α_1 is a lift of β, and by Lemma 3.5, the terminal points of α_1 and α_2 are also distinct. Then, f, α_1, α_2 and β satisfy all assumptions of Corollary 10.2, and then the desired g_1 and g_2 follow as well. This completes the proof of the lemma. □

Now, we can prove Theorem 12.1 in some special cases.

Lemma 12.5. *Theorem 12.1 holds true if* $V_{NE}(f) = 0$ *or* $V_{NE}(f) = 1$.

Proof. Let $f : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ be a normal mapping that satisfies the assumption of Theorem 12.1 and $V_{NE}(f) = 0$ or $V_{NE}(f) = 1$.

If Γ_f is locally convex in $S\backslash E$ and f has no branched point in $S\backslash E$, then f itself satisfies the conclusion of Theorem 12.1, and there is nothing to proof.

If Γ_f is not locally convex in $S\backslash E$, then $V_{NE}(f) = 1$ and by Theorem 11.1, there exists a normal mapping $g : \overline{\Delta} \to S$, such that each natural edge of g has spherical length strictly less than π,

$$L(g, \partial\Delta) \le L(f, \partial\Delta), A(g, \Delta) \ge A(f, \Delta),$$

and

$$V_{NE}(g) \le V_{NE}(f) - 1 = 0.$$

and then $V_{NE}(g) = 0$, and in this case Γ_g is locally convex in $S\backslash E$. If Theorem 12.1 holds for g, then it is clear that Theorem 12.1 holds for f. Thus we may assume that

(a) Γ_f is locally convex in $S\backslash E$.

If f has no branched point in $S\backslash E$, then there is nothing to prove again. Thus, we may complete the proof under the assumption that

(b) Γ_f is locally convex in $S\backslash E$ and f has a branched point in $S\backslash E$.

Let $p_0 \in \overline{\Delta}\backslash f^{-1}(E)$ be a ramification point of f and let $q_0 = f(p_0)$. Since $V_{NE}(f) = 0$ or 1, Γ_f has at most one natural vertex q^* outside E. Then by (a), there is a shortest path $\beta = \overline{q_0q_1}$ from q_0 to some point $q_1 \in E$ such that either $\beta \cap f(\partial\Delta) = \{q_1\}$ or $\beta \cap f(\partial\Delta) = \overline{q_0q_1}$. The later case occurs if and only if $q_0 \in \Gamma_f\backslash E$.

We may assume f has no branched point in $\beta\backslash\{q_0, q_1\}$, otherwise we take the branched point in the interior of β that is closest to q_1. Then β° has a neighborhood N satisfying the hypothesis of Lemma 12.4, and then, by Lemma 12.4, there exist two normal mappings $f_1, f_2 : \overline{\Delta} \to S$, satisfying the following two conditions.

(c) Each natural edge of f_j is a natural edge of f, $j = 1, 2$, and each natural edge of Γ_f is a natural edge of f_1 or f_2.

(d) $L(f, \partial\Delta) = L(f_1, \partial\Delta) + L(f_2, \partial\Delta)$ and $A(f, \Delta) = A(f_1, \Delta) + A(f_2, \Delta)$.

By (c), we have

$$n = V(f) = V(f_1) + V(f_2). \tag{12.3}$$

It is clear by (c) that if $V_{NE}(f) = 0$, then $V_{NE}(f_1) = V_{NE}(f_2) = 0$, and if $V_{NE}(f) = 1$, then the the unique natural vertex q^* of Γ_f outside E can not be contained in both Γ_{f_1} and Γ_{f_2}, but q^* must be a convex natural vertex of Γ_{f_1} or Γ_{f_2} and both f_1 and f_2 satisfy the assumption of Theorem 12.1. Summarizing, we may assume

(e) $V_{NE}(f_1) = 0$, $V_{NE}(f_2) = 1$, and f_1 and f_2 satisfy (a).

On the other hand, by Lemma 12.1 and (e) we have

$$V(f_1) \geq 4 \text{ and } V(f_2) \geq 3. \tag{12.4}$$

Thus, we have

$$n = V(f) \geq 7,$$

and by (12.3) we have

$$V(f_1) \leq V(f) - 3 \text{ and } V(f_2) \leq V(f) - 3. \tag{12.5}$$

We have in fact proved that under the assumption (b), $n \geq 7$. Thus, Theorem 12.1 holds true in case (a) with $n \leq 6$. From this and the above arguments for the existence of f_1 and f_2 satisfying (c), (d), (e) and (12.5) we can prove the theorem, under the assumption (a), by induction on $n = V(f)$. This completes the proof. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 12.1. We prove Theorem 12.1 by induction on the sum $V_{NE}(f) + V(f)$.

By Lemma 12.1 we have $V(f) \geq 3$, and then $V_{NE} + V(f) = 3$ holds only in the case $V_{NE} = 0$, but by Lemma 12.1, $V_{NE} = 0$ implies $V(f) \geq 4$. Thus

$$V_{NE}(f) + V(f) \geq 4,$$

and equality holds if and only if $V_{NE}(f) = 0$ and $V(f) = 4$, or $V_{NE}(f) = 1$ and $V(f) = 3$. Thus, by Lemma 12.5, Theorem 12.1 holds true in the case $V_{NE}(f) + V(f) = 4$.

Now, let $k > 4$ be a positive integer and assume that we have proved Theorem 12.1 for the case $4 \leq V_{NE}(f) + V(f) \leq k$. Let f be any normal mapping that satisfies the assumption of Theorem 12.1 with

$$V_{NE}(f) + V(f) = k + 1. \tag{12.6}$$

We call this that f is at the level $k+1$, and will show that Theorem 12.1 holds true for f.

Then, there are only three cases need to be discussed.

Case 1. The boundary curve $\Gamma_f = f(z), z \in \partial\Delta$, is locally convex in $S\backslash E$ and f has no branched point in $S\backslash E$.

Case 2. Γ_f is not convex at some natural vertex $p_1 \in (\partial\Delta) \backslash f^{-1}(E)$ of f.

Case 3. Γ_f is locally convex in $S\backslash E$, and f has a branched point in $S\backslash E$.

If Case 1 occurs, then f itself satisfies the conclusion of Theorem 12.1, and then there is nothing to proof.

Discussion of Case 2. In this case, by Theorem 11.1 it is clear that there exists a normal mapping $f_1 : \overline{\Delta} \to S$, such that each natural edge of f_1 has spherical length strictly less than π,

$$L(f_1, \partial\Delta) \leq L(f, \partial\Delta), A(f_1, \Delta) \geq A(f, \Delta), \tag{12.7}$$

and

$$V_{NE}(f_1) \leq V_{NE}(f) - 1 \text{ and } V(f_1) \leq V(f) + 1. \tag{12.8}$$

If one of the equalities of (12.8) fails, then by (12.6), f_1 is at the level of k, and by the induction hypothesis, Theorem 12.1 holds for f_1 and by (12.7), Theorem 12.1 holds for f. If both of the equalities in (12.8) hold true, then f_1 is still at the level of $k+1$, but

$$V_{NE}(f_1) = V_{NE}(f) - 1. \tag{12.9}$$

Then, f_1 satisfies the assumption of Theorem 12.1, and then we return to Cases 1, 2, or 3. If Case 1 occurs for f_1, then Theorem 12.1 holds for f_1, and then Theorem 12.1 holds for f by (12.7). If Case 2 occurs, then we can replace f by f_1 and repeat the discussion of Case 2. By (12.9), we can not always return to Case 2 from Case 2. Thus, Repeating discussion for Case 2 finitely many times, we return to either Case 1 or Case 3. If we return to Case 1, the proof is completed, and if we return to Case 3, we continue the following discussion.

Discussion of Case 3. By Theorem 10.1, there exist two normal mappings $g_j : \overline{\Delta} \to S, j = 1, 2$, such that the followings hold.

(a1) Each natural edge of g_j has spherical length strictly less than $\pi, j = 1, 2$.

(a2) $\sum_{j=1}^{2} L(g_j, \partial\Delta) \leq L(f, \partial\Delta), \sum_{j=1}^{2} A(g_j, \Delta) \geq A(f, \Delta)$.

(a3) $V_{NE}(g_1) + V_{NE}(g_2) \leq V_{NE}(f) + 2$.

(a4) $V(g_1) + V(g_2) \leq V(f) + 2$.

By Lemma 12.1 and (a1), $V(g_j) \geq 3, j = 1, 2$, and so by (a4) we have

(a5) $V(g_j) \leq V(f) - 1, j = 1, 2$.

Then there are only two cases:

Case 2.1 $V_{NE}(g_j) \geq 2, j = 1, 2$.

Case 2.2 $V_{NE}(g_1) \leq V_{NE}(g_2)$ and $V_{NE}(g_1) = 0$ or 1.

Discussion of Case 2.1. In this case, by (a3) we have $V_{NE}(g_j) \leq V_{NE}(f)$, and then by (a5) and (12.6) we have

$$V_{NE}(g_j) + V(g_j) \leq V_{NE}(f) + V(f) - 1 = k, j = 1, 2,$$

i.e. both g_1 and g_2 are at level $\leq k$. Then by (a1) and the induction hypothesis, Theorem 12.1 holds for g_1 and g_2, and then by (a2) and the induction hypothesis, Theorem 12.1 holds for f.

Discussion of Case 2.2. Assume

$$V_{NE}(g_1) = 0 \text{ or } 1. \tag{12.10}$$

Then by Lemma 12.3

$$L(g_1, \partial\Delta) \geq \pi. \tag{12.11}$$

We first show that

$$V_{NE}(g_2) + V(g_2) \leq V_{NE}(f) + V(f) \leq k + 1. \tag{12.12}$$

If $V_{NE}(g_1) = 0$, then by Lemma 12.1 we have $V(g_1) \geq 4$, and then by (a3) and (a4) we have (12.12). If $V_{NE}(g_1) = 1$, then by (a3) and (a5) we still have (12.12)

If $V_{NE}(g_2) + V(g_2) < k + 1$, then Theorem 12.1 holds for g_2 by the induction hypothesis; and on the other hand, by (12.10) and (a1), Theorem 12.1 holds for g_1; and therefore, by (a2) Theorem 12.1 holds for f.

Now, we assume

$$V_{NE}(g_2) + V(g_2) = k + 1,$$

i.e., g_2 is in the level $k+1$. Then we can return to Cases 1–3 and repeat the same discussion for g_2. We can prove Theorem 12.1 by repeating the above arguments finitely many times, since by (12.11), Case 2.2 can not occur infinitely times. This completes the proof. □

13. Decomposition of fat mappings

In this section we prove Theorem 13.1. This is the third key step to prove the main theorem in Section 14.

A normal mapping $g : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ is called *fat* if and only if $\Delta \backslash f^{-1}([0, +\infty])$ has a component D such that $f : D \to S\backslash[0, +\infty]$ is a homeomorphism.

By Corollary 7.1, if g satisfies all assumptions of Theorem 7.1, then g is fat if and only if

$$f(\partial D) \subset [0, +\infty].$$

Theorem 13.1. *Let $f : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ be a normal mapping that satisfies (a)–(d) of Theorem 7.1, that is, the following conditions (a)–(d) hold.*

(a) Each natural edge of the boundary curve $\Gamma_f = f(z), z \in \partial\Delta$, has length strictly less than π.

(b) $\Gamma_f = f(z), z \in \partial\Delta$, is locally convex in $S\backslash E, E = \{0, 1, \infty\}$.

(c) f has no branched point in $S\backslash E$.

(d) $\Gamma_f \cap [0, +\infty]$ contains at most finitely many points.

If f is fat, then there exist two normal mappings $f_j : \overline{\Delta} \to S, j = 1, 2,$ such that f_1 and f_2 satisfy (a)–(d) and

$$A(f_1, \Delta) + A(f_2, \Delta) = A(f, \Delta) - 4\pi,$$

$$L(f_1, \partial\Delta) + L(f_2, \partial\Delta) = L(f, \partial\Delta),$$

f_1 maps $[-1, 1] \subset \overline{\Delta}$ homeomorphically onto $\overline{0, 1} \subset S$ and f_2 maps $[-1, 1]$ homeomorphically onto $\overline{1, \infty} \subset S$.

The geometrical meaning of this theorem is that we can cut off the whole Riemann sphere S, with $[0, +\infty]$ being removed, from the interior of the Riemann surface of f and then sew up the cut edges along $[0, +\infty]$. Then we obtain two Riemann surfaces that are only joint at $1 \in S$, and the boundary curve of these two surfaces compose the boundary curve Γ_f.

Proof. Let Δ_1 be a component of $\Delta\backslash f^{-1}([0, +\infty])$ such that $f(\partial\Delta_1) \subset [0, +\infty]$.

Then by Corollary 7.1, $f|_{\overline{\Delta_1}} : \overline{\Delta_1} \to S$ is normal and surjective, $f(\partial\Delta_1) = [0, +\infty]$ and f restricted to Δ_1 is a homeomorphism onto $S\backslash[0, +\infty]$. Then the restriction

$$f : \partial\Delta_1 \to [0, +\infty]$$

is a folded two to one mapping and we can express $\partial\Delta_1$ to be

$$\partial\Delta_1 = \beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3 + \beta_4$$

such that f maps $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4$ homeomorphically onto $\overline{0, 1}, \overline{1, \infty}, \overline{\infty, 1}, \overline{1, 0}$, respectively and $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4$ are arranged anticlockwise in $\partial\Delta_1$. Denote by p_j the initial points of $\beta_j, j = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Then

$$f(p_1) = 0, f(p_2) = f(p_4) = 1, f(p_3) = \infty,$$

which implies

$$p_j \in \partial\Delta, j = 1, 2, 3, 4,$$

by the definition of normal mappings. We denote by α_j the section of $\partial\Delta$ from p_j to $p_{j+1}, j = 1, 2, 3, 4$ $(p_5 = p_1)$.

We first show that the interior of β_j is contained in Δ for $j = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Assume β_1 has an interior point p_0 with $p_0 \in \partial\Delta$. Then it is clear that p_0 is in the interior of α_1 and $p_0 \neq 0, 1, \infty$, and then, by (b) the section $\Gamma_{\alpha_1} = f(z), z \in \alpha_1$, of Γ_f is convex at p_0, and by (c), f is regular at p_0. On the other hand, $\Gamma_{\beta_1} = f(z), z \in -\beta_1$, which is the simple path $\overline{1, 0}$, is obviously convex by the definition. Therefore, Lemma 6.3 applies to $p_0, \alpha_1, -\beta_1$ and f, and then α_1 has a neighborhood contained in β_1. This contradicts (d), for $\alpha_1 \subset \partial\Delta$ and $\beta_1 = \overline{0, 1} \subset [0, +\infty]$. Thus the interior of β_1 is contained in Δ. For the same reason, the interiors of β_2, β_3 and β_4 are all contained in Δ .

We have proved that $\Delta\backslash\Delta_1$ contains four disjoint Jordan domains D_j enclosed by $\alpha_j - \beta_j$ with $\overline{D_j} \cap \overline{D_{j+1}} = \{p_{j+1}\}, j = 1, 2, 3, 4$ ($D_5 = D_1$ and $p_5 = p_1$).

Now, we glue $\overline{D_1}$ and $\overline{D_4}$ along β_1 and $-\beta_4$ so that $x \in \beta_1$ and $y \in -\beta_4$ are identified if and only if $f(x) = f(y)$. The glued closed domain can be understood to be the unit disk $\overline{\Delta}$ so that β_1 and $-\beta_4$ both become the diameter $[-1, 1]$ of $\overline{\Delta}$. In this way we have in fact glued the restrictions $f|_{\overline{D_1}}$ and $f|_{\overline{D_4}}$ to be a normal mapping $f_1 : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ such that f_1 maps $[-1, 1] \subset \overline{\Delta}$ homeomorphically onto $\overline{0, 1} \subset S$.

Similarly, we can glue the restrictions $f|_{\overline{D_2}}$ and $f|_{\overline{D_3}}$ to be a normal mapping $f_2 : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ such that f_2 maps $[-1, 1]$ homeomorphically onto $\overline{1, \infty}$.

It is clear that f_1 and f_2 satisfies all the conclusions of the Theorem. As a matter of fact, the above process just cut off $f(\Delta_1)$, the sphere S with $[0, +\infty]$ being removed, from the interior of the Riemann surface of f and then sew up the cut edges along $[0, +\infty]$. Then we obtain two Riemann surfaces that are only joint at $1 \in S$, and the boundary curve of these two surfaces compose the boundary curve Γ_f. This completes the proof. □

14. Proof of the main theorem

We first prove the main theorem under certain conditions.

Lemma 14.1. *Let* $f : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ *be a normal mapping that is not fat and satisfies (a)–(d) of Theorem 7.1. Then*

$$A(f, \Delta) < 2L(f, \partial\Delta),$$

and

$$A(f, \Delta) < h_0 L(f, \partial\Delta) - A(f, \Delta),$$

where h_0 *is given by (1.3).*

Proof. The second inequality follows from the first one directly, for $h_0 > 4$. So we only prove the first inequality.

Since f is not fat, for each component D of $\Delta\backslash f^{-1}([0, +\infty])$, $f(\partial D)\backslash[0, +\infty] \neq \emptyset$, and so by (d) the interior α_0 of $(\partial D) \cap (\partial\Delta)$ is not empty, and then by Theorem 7.1,

$$L(f, (\partial D) \cap (\partial\Delta)) > L(f, (\partial D)\backslash (\partial\Delta)),$$

$f(\overline{D})$ is contained in some hemisphere of S, which implies

$$A(f(D)) < 2\pi,$$

and f restricted to D is a homeomorphism.

Then we have

$$2L(f, (\partial D) \cap (\partial\Delta)) > L(f, (\partial D) \cap (\partial\Delta)) + L(f, (\partial D)\backslash (\partial\Delta)) = L(f, \partial D). \tag{14.1}$$

If $L(f, \partial D) \geq 2\pi$, then we have

$$A(f, D) = A(f(D)) < 2\pi \leq L(f, \partial D),$$

and if $L(f, \partial D) < 2\pi$, then by Theorem 4.3 we have

$$A(f, D) < L(f, \partial D),$$

and then by (14.1), in both cases we have

$$A(f, D) < 2L(f, (\partial D) \cap (\partial\Delta)). \tag{14.2}$$

By Theorem 7.1 it is clear that for any pair D_1 and D_2 of distinct components of $\Delta \backslash f^{-1}([0, +\infty])$, $(\partial D_1) \cap (\partial\Delta)$ and $(\partial D_2) \cap (\partial\Delta)$ contains at most two common points, and on the other hand, by the same theorem, $\Delta \backslash f^{-1}([0, +\infty])$ contains only finitely many components. Thus, we have

$$L(f, \partial\Delta) = \sum_D L(f, (\partial D) \cap (\partial\Delta)),$$

where the sum runs over all components D of $\Delta \backslash f^{-1}([0, +\infty])$. Then, summing up (14.2), we have

$$A(f, \Delta) = \sum_D A(f, D) < 2 \sum_D L(f, (\partial D) \cap (\partial\Delta)) = 2L(f, \partial\Delta).$$

This completes the proof. □

Lemma 14.2. *Let $f : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ be a normal mapping that is fat and satisfies (a)–(d) of Theorem 7.1. Then*

$$A(f, \Delta) \leq h_0 L(f, \partial\Delta) - 4\pi.$$

where h_0 is given by (1.3).

Proof. By Theorem 13.1, there exist normal mappings $g_j : \overline{\Delta} \to S, j = 1, 2, \ldots, n+1$, such that for each $j \leq n + 1$ the followings hold.

(e) Each g_j satisfies all assumptions (a)–(d) of theorem 7.1, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, n + 1$.

(f) Each g_j is not fat, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, n + 1$.

(g) g_j maps the diameter $[-1, 1]$ of $\overline{\Delta}$ homeomorphically onto the real interval $\overline{0, 1}$ in S or onto $\overline{1, \infty}$ in S.

(h) $A(f, \Delta) = 4n\pi + \sum_{j=1}^{n+1} A(g_j, \Delta), L(f, \partial\Delta) = \sum_{j=1}^{n+1} L(g_j, \partial\Delta)$.

Let j be any positive integer with $j \leq n + 1$ and consider the mapping g_j. By (e) and (f), Lemma 14.1 applies. Then we have

$$A(g_j, \Delta) < 2L(g_j, \partial\Delta), \tag{14.3}$$

and then

$$\begin{aligned} 4\pi + A(g_j, \Delta) &< 2L(g_j, \partial\Delta) + 4\pi \\ &= (2 + \frac{4\pi}{L(g_j, \partial\Delta)}) L(g_j, \partial\Delta), \end{aligned}$$

and, considering that $2 + \frac{4\pi}{L(g_j, \partial\Delta)} \leq 4$ in the case $L(g_j, \partial\Delta) \geq 2\pi$, we have

(k) If $L(g_j, \partial\Delta) \geq 2\pi$, then

$$4\pi + A(g_j, \Delta) < 4L(g_j, \partial\Delta).$$

By Theorem 4.3, we have

(l) If $\sqrt{2}\pi \leq L(g_j, \partial\Delta) < 2\pi$, then

$$4\pi + A(g_j, \Delta) < 4L(g_j, \partial\Delta).$$

By (g) and Theorem 4.4, we have
(m) If $L(g_j, \partial\Delta) < \sqrt{2}\pi$, then

$$4\pi + A(g_j, \Delta) \leq h_0 L(g_j, \partial\Delta),$$

where h_0 is given by (1.3).

Summarizing (k)–(m) and the fact that $h_0 > 4$, we have in any case

$$4\pi + A(g_j, \Delta) \leq h_0 L(g_j, \partial\Delta), j = 1, \ldots, n+1,$$

and then by (h), we have

$$\begin{aligned} A(f, \Delta) &= 4n\pi + \sum_{j=1}^{n+1} A(g_j, \Delta) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{n+1} (4\pi + A(g_j, \Delta)) - 4\pi \\ &\leq h_0 \sum_{j=1}^{n+1} L(g_j, \partial\Delta) - 4\pi \\ &= h_0 L(f, \partial\Delta) - 4\pi. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

Proof of the Main Theorem. Let $f : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ be any nonconstant holomorphic mapping such that $f(\Delta) \cap E = \emptyset$. Then for any positive number

$$\varepsilon < \frac{1}{4h_0} \min\{4\pi, A(f, \Delta)\}, \tag{14.4}$$

there exists a Jordan domain $D \subset \Delta$ such that f restricted to D is a normal mapping,

$$A(f, D) \geq A(f, \Delta) - \varepsilon \text{ and } L(f, \partial D) < L(f, \Delta) + \varepsilon, \tag{14.5}$$

and the following condition holds.

(1) Each natural edge of the restricted mapping $f|_{\overline{D}}$ has spherical length strictly less than π.

Let h be a homeomorphism from $\overline{\Delta}$ onto $\overline{D}$ and let $F = f \circ h$. Then by (1) $F : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ is a normal mapping satisfying the assumption of Theorem 12.1 with $A(F, \Delta) = A(f, D)$ and $L(F, \partial\Delta) = L(f, \partial D)$. Then by (14.5) we have that

$$A(F, \Delta) \geq A(f, \Delta) - \varepsilon \text{ and } L(F, \partial\Delta) < L(f, \Delta) + \varepsilon; \tag{14.6}$$

and by Theorem 12.1 there exist a number of m normal mappings $f_j : \overline{\Delta} \to S, j = 1, \ldots m$, such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m} A(f_j, \Delta) \geq A(F, \Delta) \text{ and } \sum_{j=1}^{m} L(f_j, \partial\Delta) \leq L(F, \partial\Delta), \tag{14.7}$$

and for each j the followings hold.

(A) Each natural edge of the boundary curve $\Gamma_{f_j} = f_j(z), z \in \partial\Delta$, has spherical length strictly less than π.

(B) $\Gamma_{f_j} = f_j(z), z \in \partial\Delta$, is locally convex in $S\backslash E$.

(C) f_j has no branched point in $S\backslash E$.

Then, by Lemma 7.2, for the above ε and each $j \leq m$, there exists a normal mapping $g_j : \overline{\Delta} \to S$ such that

$$A(g_j, \Delta) \geq A(f_j, \Delta), L(g_j, \partial\Delta) < L(f_j, \partial\Delta) + \frac{\varepsilon}{m}, \tag{14.8}$$

and g_j satisfies (d) in Theorem 7.1 and (A)–(C), say, g_j satisfies all hypotheses of Theorem 7.1. Then by Lemmas 14.1 and 14.2 we have

$$A(g_j, \Delta) \leq h_0 L(g_j, \partial\Delta) - \min\{A(g_j, \Delta), 4\pi\}, j = 1, \ldots, m. \tag{14.9}$$

On the other hand, if for some $j_0 \leq m$, $A(g_{j_0}, \Delta) \geq 4\pi$, then we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m} \min\{A(g_j, \Delta), 4\pi\} \geq 4\pi,$$

and if $A(g_j, \Delta) < 4\pi$ for all $j \leq m$, then we have, by (14.8), (14.7), (14.6) and (14.4), that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=1}^{m} \min\{A(g_j, \Delta), 4\pi\} \\ = \ & \sum_{j=1}^{m} A(g_j, \Delta) \geq \sum_{j=1}^{m} A(f_j, \Delta) \geq A(F, \Delta) \\ > \ & A(f, \Delta) - \varepsilon > \frac{4h_0 - 1}{4h_0} A(f, \Delta); \end{aligned}$$

and thus, in both cases, we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m} \min\{A(g_j, \Delta), 4\pi\} \geq \min\{\frac{4h_0 - 1}{4h_0} A(f, \Delta), 4\pi\}. \tag{14.10}$$

Summing up the inequalities of (14.9), by (14.10) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^{m} A(g_j, \Delta) \ & \leq \ \sum_{j=1}^{m} h_0 L(g_j, \partial\Delta) - \sum_{j=1}^{m} \min\{A(g_j, \Delta), 4\pi\} \\ & \leq \ \sum_{j=1}^{m} h_0 L(g_j, \partial\Delta) - \min\{\frac{4h_0 - 1}{4h_0} A(f, \Delta), 4\pi\}. \end{aligned} \tag{14.11}$$

By (14.8), (14.7) and (14.6) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^{m} h_0 L(g_j, \partial\Delta) \ & < \ \sum_{j=1}^{m} h_0 L(f_j, \partial\Delta) + \varepsilon h_0 \leq h_0 L(F, \partial\Delta) + \varepsilon h_0 \\ & < \ h_0 L(f, \Delta) + 2\varepsilon h_0, \end{aligned}$$

i.e.

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m} h_0 L(g_j, \partial\Delta) < h_0 L(f, \Delta) + 2\varepsilon h_0. \tag{14.12}$$

By (14.6)–(14.8) we have

$$A(f,\Delta) \le \sum_{j=1}^{m} A(g_j,\Delta) + \varepsilon. \tag{14.13}$$

Therefore, we have by (14.11)–(14.13)

$$\begin{aligned} A(f,\Delta) &\le \sum_{j=1}^{m} A(g_j,\Delta) + \varepsilon \\ &\le \sum_{j=1}^{m} h_0 L(g_j,\partial\Delta) - \min\{\frac{4h_0-1}{4h_0}A(f,\Delta),4\pi\} \\ &< h_0L(f,\Delta) + 2\varepsilon h_0 + \varepsilon - \min\{\frac{4h_0-1}{4h_0}A(f,\Delta),4\pi\} \\ &\le h_0L(f,\Delta) + \frac{2h_0+1}{4h_0}\min\{A(f,\Delta),4\pi\} - \min\{\frac{4h_0-1}{4h_0}A(f,\Delta),4\pi\}, \end{aligned}$$

and considering that $h_0 > 4$, we have

$$A(f,\Delta) < h_0L(f,\Delta).$$

It remains to show that the lower is sharp.

We give an example to show that h_0 given by (1.3) is a sharp lower bound of the constant h in (1.1).

As in Section 1, we denote by D the spherical disk in S with diameter $\overline{1,\infty}$, the shortest path in S from 1 to ∞, and for $l \in [\pi, \sqrt{2}\pi]$ denote by D_l the domain contained in the disk D such that the boundary ∂D_l is composed of two congruent circular arcs, each of which has endpoints $\{1,\infty\}$ and spherical length $\frac{l}{2}$. Then, $l = L(\partial D_l)$ and by (1.4) and (1.5), the number h_0 given by (1.3) is the maximum value of the function $\frac{4\pi + A(D_l)}{l}$ and

$$h_0 = \frac{4\pi + A(D_{l_0})}{l_0}$$

for some $l_0 \in (\pi, \sqrt{2}\pi)$.

It is clear that D_{l_0}, regarded as a domain in $\mathbb{C}$, is an angular domain whose vertex is 1 and bisector is the ray $[1,+\infty)$ in $\mathbb{C}$. We denote by $2\theta_0$ the value of the angle of this angular domain. Then it is clear that $\theta_0 < \frac{\pi}{2}$.

Let M_1 be the angular domain in $\mathbb{C}$ defined by

$$M_1 = \{re^{i\theta};\ r > 0, 0 < \theta < \frac{\theta_0}{m}\}$$

and let Σ_1 be the angular domain in $\mathbb{C}$ defined by

$$\Sigma_1 = \{1 + re^{i\theta};\ 0 < r < +\infty, -\theta_0 < \theta < \pi\}.$$

Then it is easy to construct a homeomorphism f_0 from the closure $\overline{M_1}$ of M_1 in $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$ onto the closure $\overline{\Sigma_1}$ of Σ_1 in $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$, such that f_0 maps the ray $\arg z = \frac{\theta_0}{m}$ onto the ray $\arg z = \pi$, maps the interval $[0,1]$ onto itself increasingly, maps the ray $[1,+\infty]$ onto the ray

$$z = 1 + re^{-i\theta_0}, r \in [0,+\infty]$$

and f_0 is holomorphic on M_1.

Let

$$M_2 = e^{\frac{\theta_0}{m}}M_1 = \{e^{\frac{\theta_0}{m}}z;\ z \in M_1\}.$$

Then, by the Schwarz symmetry principle, we can extend f_0 to be an open and continuous mapping f_1 from the closed angular domain

$$A_1 = \overline{M_1 \cup M_2} = \{z \in \overline{\mathbb{C}}; 0 \leq \arg z \leq \frac{2\theta_0}{m}\}$$

onto $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$ such that f_1 maps the segments

$$l_k = \left\{re^{i\frac{k\theta_0}{m}}, r \in [0,1]\right\}, k = 0, 1,$$

homeomorphically onto the interval $[0,1]$, respectively; f_1 maps the segments

$$L_k = \left\{re^{i\frac{k\theta_0}{m}}, r \in [1,+\infty]\right\}, k = 0, 1,$$

homeomorphically onto the segments

$$l^- = \left\{1 + re^{-i\theta_0}, r \in [0,+\infty]\right\}$$

and

$$l^+ = \left\{1 + re^{i\theta_0}, r \in [0,+\infty]\right\},$$

respectively; and f_1 restricted to the domain A_1 is a holomorphic mapping that covers the domain D_{l_0} two times and covers the domain $\mathbb{C}\backslash\overline{D_{l_0}}$ one times.

Let

$$A_1^* = A_1^\circ \cup l_0^\circ \cup l_1^\circ,$$

where A_1° is the interior of A_1, and let

$$A_k^* = e^{i\frac{2(k-1)\theta_0}{m}} A_1^* = \{e^{i\frac{2(k-1)\theta_0}{m}} z; z \in A_1^*\}, k = 2, \ldots, m.$$

Then for each $k = 1, \ldots, m$ we can defined a continuous function f_k on A_k^* inductively: f_{k+1} is obtained from f_k by Schwarz symmetry principle cross the symmetry axis

$$l_k = \{re^{i\frac{2k\theta_0}{m}}, r \in [0,1]\}.$$

Let H^+ be the upper half plane $\mathrm{Im} z > 0$ in $\mathbb{C}$ and let

$$K = H^+ \backslash \cup_{k=1}^{m-1} \{re^{i\frac{2k\theta_0}{m}}, r \in [1,+\infty)\}.$$

Then $K = (\cup_{k=1}^m A_k^*) \backslash (l_0 \cup l_m)$ and $f_1, \ldots, f_m$ can be patched to be a holomorphic function f defined on $K \cup (-\infty,+\infty)$, by the Schwarz symmetric principle. It is clear that K is a simply connected domain and there is a conformal mapping h from Δ onto K such that h can be extended to be a continuous function $\widetilde{h}$ such that when z goes around $\partial\Delta$ once, $\widetilde{h}(z)$ describes the boundary section $(-\infty,+\infty)$ of K once and the boundary sections $\{re^{i\frac{k\theta_0}{m}}, r \in [1,+\infty)\}$ twice for $k = 1, \ldots, m-1$.

Let $g = f \circ \widetilde{h}$. Then $g : \overline{\Delta} \to \overline{\mathbb{C}}$ is a continuous mapping that is holomorphic in Δ and when we regard g as a mapping from $\overline{\Delta}$ to S, g restricted to Δ covers $S\backslash D_{l_0}$ by m times and covers D_{l_0} by $2m$ times and the boundary curve $\Gamma_g = g(z), z \in \partial\Delta$, covers ∂D_{l_0} by m times and covers the shortest path $\overline{0,1}$ in S from 0 to 1 by 2 times.

Then we have

$$A(g,\Delta) = 4m\pi + mA(D_{l_0})$$

and

$$L(g,\partial\Delta) = 2L(\overline{0,1}) + mL(\partial D_{l_0}) = \pi + ml_0,$$

and then

$$\frac{A(g,\Delta)}{L(g,\partial\Delta)} = \frac{4m\pi + mA(D_{l_0})}{\pi + mL(\partial D_{l_0})} < \frac{4\pi + A(D_{l_0})}{l_0} = h_0.$$

It is clear that as $m \to +\infty$, $\frac{A(g,\Delta)}{L(g,\partial\Delta)} = \frac{4m\pi + mA(D_{l_0})}{\pi + mL(\partial D_{l_0})}$ converges to h_0. This completes the proof. $\square$

References

[1] L. Ahlfors, Zur Theorie der Üherlagerung-Sflächen, Acta Math., 65 (1935), 157-194.

[2] F. Bernstein, Über die isoperimetrische Eigenschaft des Kreises auf der Kugeloberfläche und in der Ebene, Math. Ann., vol. 60 (1905), pp. 117-136.

[3] J. Dufresnoy, Sur les. domaines couverts. parles valeurs d'une. fonction. méromorphe. ou. algébroide, Ann. Sci. École. Norm. Sup. 58. (1941),. 179-259.

[4] W.K. Hayman, Meromorphic functions, Oxford, 1964.

[5] T. Radó, The Isoperimetric Inequality on the Sphere, Amer. Jour. Math., Vol.57, No.4. (Oct.,1935), pp.765-770.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, TSINGHUA UNIVERSITY, BEIJING 100084, P. R. CHINA. *Email: gyzhang@math.tsinghua.edu.cn*